

TWO DECADES OF NATIONAL
SOCIALISM, 1923-1943

HITLER'S WORDS

WITH AN INTRODUCTION
BY FREDERICK SCHUMAN

Edited by Gordon W. Prange



American Council on Public Affairs 1944

DDP
L. J. J.
A.

TO ANNE AND MOTHER

all.

all.

**COPYRIGHT, 1944, BY AMERICAN COUNCIL ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS
M. B. SCHNAPPER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND EDITOR**

**PUBLISHED AT 2153 FLORIDA AVE., N. W., WASHINGTON 8, D. C.
PRINTED IN THE U. S. BY MONUMENTAL PRINTING CO.**

Introduction

In presenting to American readers these significant excerpts from Adolf Hitler's utterances over a period of twenty years (1922-1943), the American Council on Public Affairs has performed a service which will help to win the war and may help to win the peace.

It is a curious fact, symptomatic of democratic blindness during the wasted years, that *Mein Kampf* was not made fully available to the English-speaking world until the year in which Hitler openly launched his armed assault upon civilization. Hitler's recent speeches, edited by Norman Baynes, were not published in translation, even in Great Britain, until the years of disaster, 1940. The Western democracies were not forewarned because their peoples had no desire to be forewarned. The present volume completes the all-too-belated work of Hitlerian documentation. It is indispensable to an adequate understanding of the enemy. And to know the enemy is half the battle.

Dr. Prange deserves thanks on two grounds for painstakingly bringing together the present compilation. He has made available, chiefly from the files of the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, many of Hitler's statements which are nowhere else to be found in English. He has also edited and arranged the material in a fashion which insures its maximum readability and usefulness to the general reader. It is a safe guess that few Americans have had the hardihood to wade through all of the turgid prose of *Mein Kampf*, and those who have done so have seen the *Fuehrer* and his *Bewegung* only in the early years of the Nazi frenzy. The 2000 pages of Hitler's speeches issued in chronological order and with full texts, under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, are too formidable for any but specialists. Even the 1000 pages of *My New Order*, edited by Raoul de Roussy de Sales, are likewise not easy reading for the layman.

But here, in less than 400 pages, are all of Hitler's more important pronouncements, arranged by broad topics and so assembled as to present a complete ideological and political panorama of the awe-inspiring son of Alois Schicklgruber. Each excerpt is identified as to time, place and source. Many are commented upon in helpful footnotes.

Hitler's basic conceptions of politics and human relations are clearly presented in "Pillars of the Faith." In "The Dynamics of Lebensraum" the reader can trace the course of the Nazi will-to-

conquest and its stereotyped rationalizations. The sections on "Democracy, Pacifism and Internationalism," "Culture Politics," "Perish the Jew" and "Bolshevik Bugaboo" comprise a striking self-portrait of the Nazi *Weltanschauung*. The sections on "Strategy of Peace," "Assurances, Pledges and Promises" and "Partners for Conquest" illustrate the techniques of Nazi diplomacy, while "The Stab-in-the-Back Myth" and "Wilson's Fourteen Points" pose persistent problems of political and psychological warfare which each day's events render more pressing.

It is to be hoped that those who read these chapters will not leave them in any complacent spirit of pride that they are not as this man is, nor in any confident mood that he and all the evil he symbolizes will soon be expunged from the earth in fire and blood. One great source of Hitler's power has always been the fact that he is the embodiment not only of all that is base and barbarous in the German soul but of all that is narrow and selfish, provincial and fanatical, foul and poisonous in the souls of all men and women everywhere in an epoch of insecurity and fear. Here, writ large, are credos that many Americans are still quite prepared to accept if only they are couched in a slightly different vocabulary. Here is but a pathological exaggeration of racial discrimination, national conceit, fear of the "Red Menace," contempt for democracy, intolerance of dissent, imperial pretensions and the gospel of "My country, right or wrong!"

If the United Nations remain united, Hitler and Hitlerism will not survive the onslaught of a world in arms against them. But it is perfectly possible that the victors, without knowing what they do, may yet embrace the vices of the vanquished and move toward goals as yet unseen which will be no less monstrous than those which Hitler has always served. If the America of tomorrow becomes a land of fear and, therefore, a haven of labor-baiters, Red-hunters, Jew-haters and irresponsible chauvinists, victory will be wasted, peace will be lost and freedom may perish in a chaos of disunity, breeding attitudes and actions no less hideous and destructive than those begotten by the demon of Berchtesgaden.

The study of Hitler may help to guard against this danger. The war between freedom and despotism, equality and persecution, brotherhood and tribalism did not begin with Hitler and will not end with the collapse of his Reich. The Austrian corporal has been merely the most striking single incarnation in our time of all that freemen have

always struggled against. In the years after Hitler the battle for human dignity and decency will still remain to be fought against the forces of bigotry and greed. This battle will go on throughout the free world, in every country and indeed in every human soul. If it is to be won, the nature of the enemy must never be forgotten.

Hitler's words will be spoken again and are sometimes spoken even now by those who are fighting Hitler. Let them, therefore, be read and reread not only as a guide to the past and a clue to the present but as a warning for the future. The categorical imperative to which the career of Hitler points was long ago stated by Thomas Jefferson: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

Editor's Preface

Although Hitler's speeches appear to be the divigations of a pathological mind, the diffuse mouthings of a hysterical demagogue, they are nevertheless potent weapons of political warfare. For all their buncombe and bombast, they present—in effect—the whole meaning and purpose of the Nazi Revolution. An entire generation of Germans has been nurtured on the ideas which are incorporated in these pages. While it is unlikely that every German has subscribed to these ideas, there can be no doubt that they have warped the thinking of the average German to such an extent as to present one of the most serious post-war problems.

The better we know the ingredients of the brew that has made political drunkards of the Germans, the better we shall be able to meet the challenge which the future holds. It is not enough that our knowledge of Nazism has helped us to face Germany as an enemy. That knowledge must also enable us to deal with her as a defeated foe. We must prepare to cure Germany of her present malady and bring her back to the road of sane and healthy political living. Should this volume contribute in some degree to our knowledge of Nazism's past and the present and serve to clarify and sharpen our post-war planning and thinking about Germany, it will more than serve its purpose.

In preparing this synthesis of Hitler's oratory from 1922 to 1943 inclusive, I examined about two thousand of Hitler's speeches, proclamations and appeals. In an attempt to present to the reader those excerpts which best portray the *Fuehrer* I have skimmed the cream of the material. The problem of selectivity was, of course, a tremendous one. To choose those statements which contained the kernel of Hitler's thought and the best expression of his technique and to weave these together into a clear pattern of his policy was no small task.

I have tried to be objective and fair and to present as much of the whole picture as was feasible in view of space limitations. Someone else might have made different and, for that matter, better selections. In the main, I have limited my selections to historically important subjects of the greatest interest to the general reader and student of international affairs. It should be added that the purpose of the notes preceding each chapter is to set the stage for the material which follows and to integrate this material with the rest of the book.

Mos of the statements were taken from the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, the official organ of the National Socialist Party. I examined this news-

paper for practically the entire course of Hitler's political career. From time to time, however, I consulted and quoted material from the following newspapers: *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Munich); *Berliner Boersen Zeitung* (Berlin); *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Berlin); *Frankfurter Zeitung* (Frankfurt-am-Main); *Koelnische Zeitung* (Cologne); *Neue Freie Presse* (Vienna); and *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* (Zurich).

Other materials which I used in this work are *Adolf Hitler's Reden* (herausgegeben von Dr. Ernest Boepple, Munich, 1934) and *Die Rede Adolf Hitlers in der ersten grossen Massenversammlung* ([*Muenchener Buergerbraeu-Keller vom 27. Februar 1925*] bei Wiederaufrichtung der Nationalsozialistischen deutschen Arbeiterpartei, Munich, 1925). I also consulted numerous other books in German which contained excerpts from Hitler's speeches. Outside of a few scattered quotes, however, they contributed relatively little. For the period since our entry into the war the Federal Communications Commission and the British Broadcasting Corporation have been kind enough to provide me with both the English translation and the German text of Hitler's recent speeches. To the best of my knowledge over half of what appears in this book has not been published in any single work in either England or America.

Anyone who translates and edits Hitler's words invites an unhappy task. It is exceedingly difficult to translate his German with complete accuracy and convey his meaning and feeling with clarity. Sometimes his words do not make sense. It is then that one must decide, upon the basis of long familiarity with Hitler's style and thinking, what he really means. On occasion I was forced to take editorial liberties in order to avoid utter confusion. In all such cases, however, I followed Hitler's original meaning as closely as possible.

A few simple examples will suffice to indicate the nature of some of the problems involved. Hitler uses the word *Persoenlichkeit* freely. The literal translation would be personality. But in English it means something different from what Hitler intended. To use personality in the translation would be inaccurate. What Hitler has in mind is the *Fuehrer*-type, the leader, the great man. I have interchangeably used the last two meanings. The word *Weltanschauung* (philosophy, world-view) for which there is scarcely an English equivalent I have left in the original German. The same holds true for *Volksgeossen* (fellow-countrymen) for which we do not have a suitable equivalent. In translating *Volk* (which is not quite the same as our word people) I have tried not to make the mistake of giving it the meaning of nation. *Volk* cannot mean nation, which is a political concept. The word *Volks-*

gemeinschaft I have referred to as people's community, though that is not entirely adequate. As for the word *Volkstum*, the term people cannot be considered satisfactory; it connotes the whole heritage and tradition of the people.

Though a great many of the translations in this volume are strictly my own, I did make use of what English versions of Hitler's speeches were available. I relied in some measure on the translations issued by the German Library of Information, permission for which was granted me in 1940. In some cases I accepted that agency's translations verbatim, in others I made numerous changes. In those translations which the Federal Communications Commission and the British Broadcasting Corporation kindly permitted me to use, I made a few minor changes for the purpose of editorial weaving.

A word about inconsistencies and repetition. Both are present in this volume. The former have arisen in part through an attempt to make an inconsistent man like Hitler consistent. The reader must bear in mind that basic inconsistency is a cardinal tenet in the *Fuehrer's* character and technique of oratory. Other inconsistencies have doubtless crept in through the usual channels. As for repetition, that is simply a fundamental part of Hitler's propagandist technique.

For various forms of assistance and encouragement in the preparation of this volume I am indebted to many. Acknowledgment is due to the Social Science Research Council for a Grant-in-Aid which enabled me to finance a part of the research and to the Library of Congress, Duke University Library, the University of Chicago Library, and the Hoover War Library at Stanford University. Special thanks go to Miss Nina Almond and Dr. Olga Hess Gankin of Stanford University for enabling me to use materials from the early issues of the *Voelkischer Beobachter*; to the British Broadcasting Corporation and the Federal Communications Commission for providing me with English translations and the original German version of Hitler's speeches since our entry into the war; to the *New York Times* for permission to quote from the issue of January 31, 1943; and to the Oxford University Press for permission to quote from *Hitler's Speeches and the United States*, a pamphlet I wrote for that organization in 1941.

Grateful thanks are extended to those friends and colleagues who gave me valuable and generous assistance and advice. In the actual work of preparing the volume, much credit must go to Mrs. Nora Lejins and Mr. John Mutziger, who helped in translating, operation of the projector for microfilm reading, and numerous clerical tasks;

and to Dr. Chester W. Clark, Dr. Donald M. Dozer, Dr. Samuel Smith and Mr. Stanley Burnshaw, who assisted me in editing. Others who aided me in my task were Dr. Augustus J. Prah, Dr. Dieter Cunz, Mr. Arthur Silver, Dr. Bernard J. Holm, and Dr. Peter Lejins of the University of Maryland; Dr. W. T. Root of the University of Iowa; and Dr. Henry Meyer and Dr. Eugene N. Anderson. I am grateful to Dr. Wesley M. Gewehr and Dean L. B. Broughton of the University of Maryland for modifying my schedule in the spring semester of 1941 to permit more concentrated work on this volume. I am also indebted to Dr. Guy Stanton Ford, Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association, who on several occasions favored me with help and advice. And I must not forget my patient and understanding students at the University of Maryland or the inspiration I received from writers on contemporary Germany from whom I have gleaned much. My deepest thanks are also due to Mr. M. B. Schnapper, Executive Secretary of the American Council on Public Affairs, without whose patience, assistance and able advice this volume would not have been completed. And I would like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to Dr. Harry G. Plum of the University of Iowa, who originally directed me into the field of German history. I owe most, however, to my wife, who not only typed the entire manuscript but who was a constant source of inspiration and encouragement throughout. Whatever success this book may achieve, the above mentioned persons must share with me. The shortcomings and errors, however are my own. No one else is responsible for them but myself.

One final word. The volume as it stands is not exactly what I had originally intended. Time and circumstances made sharp inroads upon my plans and forced me to cut the book short by several chapters. The actual writing of this work and putting it into final form were done under a degree of difficulty which at times was completely exasperating. Due to the pressure of a year-around teaching schedule and the uncertainties of life while preparing to enter the armed forces, much of the work had to be fitted into short vacations and whatever time I could manage to obtain between semesters. Many of the last-minute touches were even completed during weekends and study periods while I was attending the Naval Indoctrination School at Fort Schuyler, New York. The conditions under which I worked were far from ideal and much had to be finished in comparative haste. But I have done the best I could and I have been as thorough and careful as time allowed.

GORDON W. PRANGE

Contents

	1	
Pillars of the Faith.....		1
	2	
The Dynamics of <i>Lebensraum</i>		15
	3	
Democracy, Pacifism, and Internationalism.....		35
	4	
France, Mortal Enemy.....		53
	5	
Perish the Jew.....		67
	6	
God and Providence.....		85
	7	
Of, By, and For the People.....		99
	8	
Future <i>Fuehrers</i>		119
	9	
Culture Politics		137
	10	
Strategy of Peace		159
	11	
Assurances, Pledges, and Promises.....		179
	12	
Versailles Is to Blame.....		197
	13	
The Stab in the Back Myth.....		217
	14	
Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points.....		231
	15	
Bolshevik Bugaboo		249
	16	
Partners for Conquest.....		275
	17	
Unrighteous England		297
	18	
Pluto-Democracies		321
	19	
America and Roosevelt.....		341
	20	
Visions of Defeat.....		379



1

Pillars of the Faith

He who does not fight with a deadly weapon and does not possess the strength to plunge it with one thrust into the heart of the opponent will never be able to lead a people in the mighty battle of destiny.

Munich, March 6, 1929

The key to the world which has always opened the world to man is not international conscience or Geneva, but steel and the sword.

Muehldorf, June 21, 1931

The essence of Hitler's Weltanschauung is the doctrine that might makes right.

During his early career the dominant themes in his explosive oratory were force, power, struggle, and war. Thus he continued in the ideological tradition of Frederick the Great, Clausewitz, Bismarck, Treitschke and Spengler. And he perverted the Darwinian law of survival until survival became synonymous with domination. Insisting that all nature is a mighty struggle between strength and weakness, he exalted power as the sole determinant of the destinies of nations. With stern exhortation he held out a hard choice to the German people: be the victor or the vanquished.

The key to the real Hitler lies in the ideas he expounded in the crucial years before he became Chancellor—i.e., the years when he preached the true gospel of National Socialism, unimpeded by the diplomatic calculations that inhibited many of his utterances in the thirties. These early statements are invaluable historical documents. They present with unabashed crudity the fundamentals of the Nazi creed. In some respects they are even more revealing than Mein Kampf itself. The essence of his later actions are all here in undisguised form.

There is more than a grain of truth in Hitler's interpretation of the importance of power in the life of nations. But even a hasty analysis shows that his distortion of Darwin's biological thesis to fit grandiose plans of aggression was specious, dishonest, and, in the long run, impractical. Since 1933 he has professed to be a man of peace. Actually, he has proceeded on the principle that German destiny must be hammered out on the anvil of militarism and war. He has failed to see that man has developed his strength in his intelligence, not in his brutality. This is Germany's tragic fate.

Here, then, are the main pillars of the National Socialist faith. Here stands revealed Hitler's great historische Schuld—his conspiracy to make civilization conform to a primitive jungle law.

The Strong Over the Weak

Wars supposedly are not necessary among civilized peoples. The supposition is that disputes among nations are no longer necessary, for they are represented to be merely the expression of the oppression of one class by the particular bourgeois group dominating at the time. In the case of actual differences of opinion between nations, a court of arbitration is supposed to decide. The question, however, whether the judges of this court would have the power to bring the respective parties before the bar remains unanswered. Would a state be able to bring an accused into court if it did not have the police behind it? It is the same in the life of nations, and in the final analysis it is always a sort of divine ordeal that decides. The power which nations can bring to bear is the decisive factor. It is evident that the stronger has the right before God and the world to enforce his will. History shows that the right as such does not mean a thing, unless it is backed up by great power. If one does not have the power to enforce his right, that right alone will profit him absolutely nothing. The stronger have always been victorious. The whole of nature is a continuous struggle between strength and weakness, an eternal victory of the strong over the weak. All nature would be full of decay if it were otherwise. And the states which do not wish to recognize this law will decay. If you need an example of this kind of decay, look at the present German Reich. (Munich, April 13, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 15/16, 1923)

Self-Preservation

Fundamentally, all genuine politics is an aspiration, a search for the preservation of a people. Food, drink, and love—all are based on the drive for self-preservation. . . . It is the function of politics to work toward the goal of self-preservation. We do not know what role fate has intended for our people. Our chief desire is that it will be preserved in the future. We feel a moral obligation to preserve the race, to foster it, and to exalt it.

So it is that the most fundamental question of politics is: How shall we provide daily bread for our people? "Lord give us this day our daily bread." . . . We understand this prayer only in the respect that we work for our daily bread and then beseech the Lord to bless our work.

In the life of nations, too, the struggle for daily bread is the first

problem of politics. This problem is determined by the people itself, the size of its population, and the soil which it occupies. It is no accident, therefore, that a people, namely the Jews, whose existence has never rested on this basis, live as a parasite and has no soil and no homeland. All politics that reject this principle as the basis of a people's existence miscarries and is futile. (Nuremberg, July 4, 1926; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, July 7, 1926)

Only Force Rules

The fundamental motif through all the centuries has been the principle that force and power are the determining factors. All development is struggle. Only force rules. Force is the first law. A struggle has already taken place between original man and his primeval world. Only through struggle have states and the world become great. If one should ask whether this struggle is gruesome, then the only answer could be: For the weak, yes, for humanity as a whole, no.

World history proves that in the struggle between nations, that race has always won out whose drive for self-preservation was the more pronounced, the stronger. . . . Unfortunately, the contemporary world stresses internationalism instead of the innate values of race, democracy and the majority instead of the worth of the great leader. Instead of everlasting struggle the world preaches cowardly pacifism, and everlasting peace. These three things, considered in the light of their ultimate consequences, are the causes of the downfall of all humanity. The practical result of conciliation among nations is the renunciation of a people's own strength and their voluntary enslavement. (Essen, Nov. 22, 1926; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 26, 1926)

Politics Is Struggle

What is politics? One of the great men of our nation once said: Politics is struggle. And Clemenceau, one of our most bitter enemies, said: Politics is war. Both men are right. Politics is the struggle of a people for its existence on this earth. It is a struggle for the present and a struggle for the future. The prayer reads: Lord give us this day our daily bread. Even this Christian prayer shows that the struggle for daily bread actuates mankind—every one of us, day in and day out. (Vilsbiburg, March 6, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1927)

The Nonsense of Humanitarianism

The inventions of mankind are the result of eternal struggle. Never would aviation have progressed so remarkably had it not been for the war, had not countless thousands sacrificed their lives in this cruel struggle against nature. The struggle against the great beasts is ended, but it is being inexorably carried on against the tiny creatures—against bacteria and bacilli. There is no Marxian reconciliation on this score; it is either you or I, life or death, either extermination or servitude.

From [various] examples we arrive at the fundamental conclusion that there is no humanitarianism but only an eternal struggle, a struggle which is the prerequisite for the development of all humanity.

The borderline between man and the animal is established by man himself. The position which man enjoys today is his own accomplishment. We see before us the Aryan race which is manifestly the bearer of all culture, the true representative of all humanity. All inventions in the field of transportation must be credited to the members of a particular race. Our entire industrial science is without exception the work of the Nordics. All great composers from Beethoven to Richard Wagner are Aryans, even though they were born in Italy or France. Do not say that art is international. The tango, the shimmy, and the jazzband are international but they are not art. Man owes everything that is of any importance to the principle of struggle and to one race which has carried itself forward successfully. Take away the Nordic Germans and nothing remains but the dance of apes. . . . Because we recognize the fact that our people can endure only through struggle, we National Socialists are fighters. (Munich, April 2, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 5, 1927)

The Inevitability of Imperialism

Who is an imperialist? An imperialist is every father who begets a child and desires that his child live. An imperialist is every mother who bears a child and tries to keep her child from starving. For the realization of these goals, mankind must travel the roads of struggle, either economic struggle or struggle with weapons for life and food. Every people that is healthy shows that it has the drive to preserve itself. Only that people is healthy, therefore, which is imperial, which has the will to live. (Munich, June 3, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, June 5, 1927)

Struggle—The Source of Strength

Politics is nothing else than the struggle of a people for its existence in this world; it is the eternal battle of a people, for better or for worse, for its existence on this planet. How does this struggle take place? Great men of world history have described it. Frederick the Great said that politics is the art of serving one's people with all the means at one's disposal; according to Bismarck, politics is the art of the possible. . . . Clemenceau declared that the politics of peace was nothing else than the continuation of war with other means. Clausewitz asserted that war was nothing else than the continuation of politics with other weapons. In reality, then, politics is the struggle of a people with all weapons to the limit of its power for its existence on this earth.

With what question is struggle primarily related? It is the drive for self-preservation which leads to struggle—that is, the question of love and hunger. These are the two fundamental primitive forces around which everything on this earth centers. The total space on which life is carried on is circumscribed. This leads to a struggle of one against the other for this limited area. In addition, this area is more restricted for certain groups than for others so that their existence is dependent upon the preservation of the particular region which they inhabit.

Thus, the struggle for daily bread becomes in reality a struggle for the soil which produces this daily bread; that is, for space itself. It is an iron principle: the weak fall in order that the strong may live. . . . From all the innumerable creatures a complete species rises and becomes the master of the rest. Such a one is man—the most brutal, the most resolute creature on earth. He knows nothing but the extermination of his enemies in the world. . . . This struggle, this battle has not been carried on by all men in the same way. Certain species stand out, and at the top of the list is the Aryan. The Aryan has forged the weapons with which mankind has made itself master of the animal world. There is scarcely anything in existence which when traced back to its origin cannot claim an Aryan as its creator. . . . Never have votes and majorities added one iota to the culture of mankind. Every accomplishment is solely the result of the work and energy of great men, and as such, a flaming protest against the inertia of the masses.

How does this process then take place? It is an eternal struggle. Every achievement is nothing else than the result of a struggle of give-and-take. Every new invention is a triumph over an old one.

Every record is a struggle against that which exists. Every championship performance is a conquest of that which prevailed previously.

Hence the following principles result: The value of man is determined in the first place by his inner racial virtues; second, by the ability of the race to bring forth men who in turn become leaders in the struggle for advancement; third, this entire process takes places in the form of eternal struggle. As a consequence struggle is the father of all things in this world. (Munich, Nov. 21, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 23, 1927)

Natural Selection Among Nations

What is the most powerful force that dominates human life? First, it is the drive for momentary self-preservation, the satisfaction of hunger; second, the drive to propagate the race, the gratification of love. These two drives dominate the individual. They compel him to work. From this fact one thing in particular is apparent, namely, that when all living creatures in this world are motivated by the same drive—that is, the preservation of life at any price—then they are forced into a competitive struggle.

Man must make use of his powers. He must struggle and fight. There is no achievement without breaking down resistance. Every new deed of mankind signifies the conquest of a previous one. We see that in mankind individual giants continuously tower over the rest. There are always certain nations which proceed in advance of all the others, nations which in the eternal struggle with nature are able to discover her secrets and to make them available for the rest of humanity. These nations are thereby able to open the gates of culture for other peoples. . . . By means of this eternal struggle, the individual nations are sifted out. . . .

Why is the position of the German people so desperate? Because we need power for every enterprise. Force determines the way of life. Right exists only when it is created and protected by power and force. It bespeaks the greatness of a people of it can find the strength to raise itself upward. But when a people dances negro dances and listens only to jazz music, then we need not be surprised if it should perish, and seek out parliamentary monstrosities. He who does not honor his past is not worthy of a better future. A people must be taught to struggle. Struggle must be brought to the realization of a people. (Neustadt an der Aisch, Jan. 15, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 20, 1928)

The Fight for Life

The idea of struggle is as old as life itself, for life is only preserved because other living things perish through struggle. The two most powerful drives of man, those of hunger and love, presuppose for their satisfaction an unending struggle. In this struggle, the stronger, the more able win, while the less able, the weak lose. Struggle is the father of all things. Only through struggle has man raised himself above the animal world. Even today it is not by the principles of humanity that man lives or is able to preserve himself above the animal world, but solely by means of the most brutal struggle. As it is with the individual so it is in the destiny of nations. Only by struggle are the strong able to raise themselves above the weak. And every people that loses out in this eternally shifting struggle has, according to the laws of nature, received its just desert. A *Weltanschauung* that denies the idea of struggle is contrary to nature and will lead a people that is guided by it to destruction. The road that must be traveled by a people which wishes to develop itself still higher is not the road of comfort and ease, but the road of relentless struggle. For if you do not fight for life, then life will never be won. (Kulmbach, Feb. 5, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 9, 1928)

Originality Plus Brutality

The will to live leads beyond the limitations of the present to the struggle for the prerequisites of life. Struggle is the impulse of self-preservation in nature. Man has become great through struggle.

The first fundamental of any rational *Weltanschauung* is the fact that on earth and in the universe force alone is decisive. Whatever goal man has reached is due to his originality plus his brutality. Whatever man possesses today in the field of culture is the culture of the Aryan race. The Aryan has stamped his character on the whole world. The basis for all development is the creative urge of the individual, not the vote of majorities. The genius of the individual is decisive, not the spirit of the masses. All life is bound up in three theses: Struggle is the father of all things, virtue lies in blood, leadership is primary and decisive.

Because the German people has forgotten this, it has collapsed. And if the German people does not again acquire power, that is, power in the sense of values and will, then no other choice is left the German people but to perish. There will never be a solution of

the German problem until we return to the three fundamental principles which control the existence of every nation: The concept of struggle, the purity of blood, and the ingenuity of the individual. (Chemnitz, April 2, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 7, 1928)

Peace by the Sword

Politics is history in the making. History is the story of a people's struggle for survival. There is no distinction between war and peace. Struggle is ever present. A latent peace is only possible when one is either a free lord or a slave. The final decision lies with the sword.

In the power of the sword lies the vital strength of a nation. There is, therefore, no difference between domestic policy and foreign policy. The one is the support of the other and in turn presupposes the existence of the other. Politics cannot be carried out without the recognition of certain fundamental principles: the principle of struggle, the purity of blood, and the ideal of the leader. (Munich, May 2, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 4, 1928)

Power Against Power

The battlefield is the final test of the foreign policy of a people. Even in the Soviet State the ultimate consideration is the possibility of preserving the nation on the field of arms. If a nation is unable to do this, then its foreign policy is destined to destruction from the very beginning. The state which is unable to preserve itself in war can possess diplomatic leadership a thousand times over and still not be able to meet the final demands of battle. Whoever is unable to meet the power of his enemy with power of his own must sacrifice any active espousal of his own interests; he will be forced from one dictate to another instead of from one treaty to another. We must do away with the misleading idea that Germany has concluded treaties in the past few years. Instead, she has signed dictates as a consequence of a perfectly senseless foreign policy.

The goal of foreign policy is the preservation of a people's means of subsistence; it is nothing else than the preservation of the life of a nation. The path to this goal will, in the final analysis, always be war. The means will be the might of the nation as it is set up in its military organization, plus clever political leadership, which chooses the course of policy wisely and then employs the means ingeniously.

Any foreign policy, therefore, is linked up with the power constituted in the nation, and a resourceful organization of this power, namely the military.

It is impossible in the long run to carry out our foreign policy without building up the army. If this is not done, the results will always be negative. It is the function of domestic policy to build up the army as a means by which foreign policy can attain its ultimate goals. Domestic policy must follow lines which make possible the creation of powerful armed forces. Only when foreign policy and domestic policy work hand in hand can the problem of the subsistence of a people be solved.

Bismarck had the backing of instruments of power. He had a civil administration of great efficiency, a mighty army supported by a noble tradition and the constitution of a monarchical state. Nevertheless, this same Bismarck realized that the pursuit of his foreign policy would only be possible if it were supported by the above-mentioned factors of power. These in turn were reenforced by his diplomacy, and through the Prussian Army there was created the instrument which would realize the goals of the foreign policy of the state.

What was the most insane thing which the November traitors did? One cannot say that it was the Revolution itself, but the way in which the Revolution was carried out, that is, the disarming of the German people. By this act the young socialist state was, from the standpoint of foreign policy, surrendered to the capitalistic world. The fortification of this state was thus made impossible.

The fact is that today the German people as a nation no longer represents power, for it does not have an army of any significance beyond its relation to the German people. The problems of German policy cannot be solved if the instrument of their solution [a powerful army] is not established. (Munich, Sept. 22, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 23/24, 1928)

Man Must Kill

If men wish to live, then they are forced to kill others. The entire struggle for survival is a conquest of the means of existence which in turn results in the elimination of others from these same sources of subsistence. As long as there are peoples on this earth, there will be nations against nations and they will be forced to protect their vital rights in the same way as the individual is forced to protect his rights.

There is in reality no distinction between peace and war. Life, no matter in what form, is a process which always leads to the same result. Self-preservation will always be the goal of every individual. Struggle is ever-present and will remain. This signifies a constant willingness on the part of man to sacrifice to the utmost. Weapons, methods, instruments, formations, these may change, but in the end the struggle for survival remains. . . .

One is either the hammer or the anvil. We confess that it is our purpose to prepare the German people again for the role of the hammer. For ten years we have preached, and our deepest concern is: How can we again achieve power? We admit freely and openly that, if our Movement is victorious, we will be concerned day and night with the question of how to produce the armed forces which are forbidden us by the peace treaty. We solemnly confess that we consider everyone a scoundrel who does not try day and night to figure out a way to violate this treaty, for we have never recognized this treaty.

We admit, therefore, that as far as we are concerned the German army in its present form is not permanent. For us it will serve only as a great cadre army, that is, as a source of sergeants and officers. And in the meantime we will be continuously at work filling in the ranks. We will take every step which strengthens our arms, which augments the number of our forces, and which increases the strength of our people.

We confess further that we will dash anyone to pieces who should dare to hinder us in this undertaking. . . . Our rights will never be represented by others. Our rights will be protected only when the German Reich is again supported by the point of the German dagger. (Munich, March 15, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 17, 1929)

The Fate of Nations

Science must teach the individual the great primitive and fundamental laws, the laws of life. If these laws are disregarded, there can be no development. These fundamental laws alone explain the rise of man. They also account for the growth of our own people. These fundamental laws are from the very outset simple, as the law, for example, that as long as the world has existed, weakness has never been victorious but always strength, the mold of all life.

Life manifests itself only in the play of forces which in turn come to the fore and contribute to the further development of the whole world no matter whether we are dealing with solar systems or with

individual persons. Always and everywhere strength is the fundamental factor, never quantity alone.

Never has cowardice directed the destiny of mankind to any good. The picture mankind presents today is the outcome of our ancestral struggles. In comparison with the eighteen hundred million human beings that are in the world today, there are countless billions who, as yet scarcely born, have already died. There are countless billions who later will not be equal to the struggle of life. That which we see today is selection in terms of strength.

The domination of the white race is not the result of mutual understanding among nations. The white race has risen slowly out of bloody struggle and has given the world that which we designate as culture. Every achievement on earth has originated in struggle.

Men and nations with the proper *Weltanschauung* climb steadily, and those without it are as chaff in the wind. The decisions of the latter are beyond comprehension. The present-day political parties in Germany serve as the best illustration of what happens to political organizations without a *Weltanschauung*.

Marxism has a *Weltanschauung* which leads rapidly to destruction. We too have a *Weltanschauung*, and we are convinced that it will lead our people upwards. A *Weltanschauung* is justifiable if it leads a nation forward. The justification of this *Weltanschauung* can be ascertained through an investigation of the general laws of all nature, from an examination of all the laws which form the basis of our own life, from a logical testing of the fate of other nations which have perished, from a scientific investigation of definite methods which bring nations to a position of dominance and of the methods which are responsible for the downfall of nations. . . .

➤ We Nazis say that we have formulated a *Weltanschauung* for ourselves. This can be synthesized in a few propositions. What constitutes our importance and the importance of nations in any event is nothing that is academic *per se*. It is nothing which lies in artificial education. It is something which originally has been an integral part of one's racial heritage. This heritage of blood is our basic value, our specific weight which we, as human beings, possess once and for all. . . . The preservation of this heritage is the first and essential factor. Whenever a nation loses its racial heritage, it perishes.

➤ The second factor is that of leadership. We say that among nations it is not the majorities that are decisive but the evaluation attached to the leader. It is not the sum total but genius itself. There

is nothing of lasting importance in the world which does not owe its origin to the creative ability of the individual.

Thus a people must organize its constitution and its political life in such a way, that the greatest emphasis is placed upon the value of leadership. Leadership must not be destroyed by an artificial structure; that is, by the system of parliamentary democracy which cultivates little dwarfs—democracy which represents the conspiracy of dwarfs against him who towers head and shoulders above the masses,

→ The third factor is struggle, without which nothing on earth is created and without which nothing is preserved. Development means struggle. That is the inspiring outlook of the National Socialist *Weltanschauung*. (Munich, Nov. 29, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 3, 1929)

The Weapons of Strife

The national treasure of a people is its great men. The people with the most geniuses will be the most highly endowed. The people with the most celebrated poets, musicians, and architects will be the richest in the field of art. The people with the greatest number of famous statesmen and generals will not only achieve the most fame but also the greatest good which will be won through the power of these great men. The greatest national treasure of a people lies in the purity of its blood and in the worth of its important men. It is, therefore, logical that the destiny of a nation should be determined by its great men.

But it is not enough that a people is healthy and strong, that it is rich in men of genius. It is also necessary that a people as a whole recognize that everything on this earth is strife and struggle. Work and struggle are two concepts which are in reality one and the same. That people which makes the greatest sacrifices will achieve the most.

The weapons of struggle are varied. One nation may fight with lies, still another with its blood. We Germans were always strong in the latter weapon. At times in our history when we thought we could cheat fate, fate called unto us and said: You do not understand. If you continue to fight as you do [with lies] then you will lose, for you are fighting with weapons that I never gave you. Only when we fight with weapons that are peculiar unto us [weapons of blood] will we achieve greatness. (Weimar, April 12, 1931; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 15, 1931)

2

The Dynamics of Lebensraum

The soil upon which we live today was conquered for us by our forefathers through struggle. And the first fertilizer of this soil was not pacifist holy water but blood.

Heidelberg, Aug. 9, 1927

We need power to acquire living space. The acquisition of power is not so much a question of weapons as of the spirit which inspires a people.

Bamberg, April 29, 1928

The concept of Lebensraum has been the major ideological instrument of Nazi imperialism. National Socialist literature does not define the term clearly, nor do the Nazis give it any geographical specificity. And for good reason. To be effective as a slogan of conquest, it must remain vague and flexible enough to fit any expedient. For essential Nazi purposes, Lebensraum denotes an area sufficient to assure the Reich both economic sufficiency and military security—in short, the material basis for domination of the globe.

The notions of "living space" and expansionism are deeply rooted in German history and thought. Since the Middle Ages, the Drang nach Osten has been an important factor in German life—from the trans-Elbean movement and the exploits of the Teutonic Knights, to the colonization of Bohemia and Silesia, the partitions of Poland, the Brest-Litovsk Treaty of 1918, and the invasion of Soviet Russia in 1941.

Hitler can call upon an impressive array of theoreticians for ideological support on this point. The ideas of List, Ratzel, De Lagarde, Rohrbach, Naumann and others long antedate the Raum doctrine of the Karl Haushofer school of geopoliticians. The Fuehrer evokes a respectable German tradition when he perverts the "living space" concept for cynical purposes of military aggression.

Hitler appeals primarily to the emotions and the brutish instincts. He argues, first, that soil is basic to the existence of a people; second, that the ratio of German population to German territory is disproportionate; third, that the German people will perish if this ratio is not changed to their advantage. Hence, Germany must acquire more soil—by war, if necessary. Hitler also insists that the struggle for survival—i.e., for daily bread—is a struggle for the soil that produces this bread. Territorial expansion, therefore, is based on Hitler's law of nature. Space must be fought for and retained; land awaits him who can seize and hold it. Thus, the Fuehrer's basic concept of justice is identical with power.

Hitler's early speeches on the subject of Lebensraum are of considerable significance because they contain the fertile seeds of his Pan-German megalomania.

Hunger Knows No Legality

The natural situation [in the life of a people] would be that condition in which it could secure its existence from the produce of its own soil. In such a case, however, the people and the size of the population must have an equitable relationship with the area in which it lives. In Germany these two factors are not equitable. Quite the contrary, for there is a glaring incongruity between the two. The population grows steadily, but the area remains the same year in and year out. Neither internal colonization nor a more intensive tilling of the soil will remove this incongruity. There is only one possibility. Soil and territory must be brought into consonance with the population. Our forefathers recognized this when they colonized the East Mark [Austria] and when they conquered with the sword the region east of the Elbe. They did this because necessity forced them to it. A man who is hungry does not question the source of the piece of bread that satisfies his hunger. The same holds true in the struggle for existence among the nations. When nations are in need, they do not ask about legal rights. There is then only one question. Does a people have the power to acquire the soil and territory which it needs? (Vilsbiburg, March 6, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1927)

Soil and Bloodshed

According to an old proverb which is eternally true, struggle is the father of all things. We can judge the correctness of this statement especially in our own age. In view of our distress let us ask this question: Has our people in the struggle for its existence sacrificed too little, has it not fought hard enough; has it risked too few lives? No, there is no people who has sacrificed so much in the course of history, risked so much, or shed so much of its blood as our own people. The result of this expenditure of blood is nonetheless very sad.

After the bloody Thirty Years' War, for example, Germany had lost four-fifths of her population; in the Wars of Liberation, and in the World War, millions of lives, and the result for Germany is that she has sunk to the position of a third-rate power. This is in contrast to other peoples who shed only a small portion of their blood and yet were successful—as for example, England and France—to say nothing of other peoples. And what is the most important reason for this? The reason is that Germany's sacrifice of blood was made for unrealistic ideals, often for civil war and for senseless phantoms.

Can one help but despair for Germany's future? Germany, a na-

tion of 62,000,000, could not even prevail today against one of the smallest of the enemy states which surround her. Every war, for example, which England has waged has helped to strengthen England's position as a world power. Only a few events in Germany's foreign policy, however, can be regarded as successful. These are the settlement of the old colonial regions east of the Enns and the Elbe, German unity, and the building up of the Prussian State. But with these episodes we are practically at the end of our list. The most frightful example of futile bloodshed was the World War. We waged this war without having a goal in mind. What did Germany want at the time? To fight for honor alone, especially when it was trampled underfoot a few years later, was plain insanity.

England knew what she wanted—the defeat of Germany, the annihilation of our fleets, and the seizure of our colonies. France knew what she wanted—the dissolution of Germany. International capital knew what it wanted—the ruination of Germany's self-supporting economy. But for what did Germany fight?

Soil and territory is the only justification for an investment of blood. Daily bread, the soil from which we live—that would have been the only justification for the expenditure of blood in the World War. For centuries we have sacrificed our blood in a wasteful manner. We have engaged in a frivolous, wanton gamble.

He who speaks today of Germany as a world power should not forget that our people has declined as compared with other nations. A few hundred years ago, we were a world power. A people of 62,000,000 can be a world power under present conditions only if it is inspired with a will and a conviction. We, however, do not have inner unity. We are delivered over to wretched politicians from within and to a sad fate in foreign affairs.

The actions of any government are determined today by the faulty relationship between the population and the area on which it lives. This problem cannot be solved by pointing to clouds with a silver lining. It can be solved only by recognizing the basic fact that our soil is too small, that we must export men or goods or expand our soil. And in order to do this, power is necessary. (Munich, March 30, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 1, 1927)

The Fight for Space

If you do not give us space on this earth then we ourselves will take this space. That is why we are National Socialists. We fight

for the vital rights of our people in this world. The blood of millions can be pledged only if they know that the conflict does not serve a particular class, but that it benefits the entire people. Do not believe that this people will go to war again, if it does not carry a different conviction to the battlefield than it did formerly. The day will come when the German people will rise up and break their bonds asunder, when in millions of hearts there will be one single faith, one embracing conviction: We do not fight for the German middle class, nor for the German proletariat; we fight for our people, for wife and child, we fight for our children's children.

I am happy that fate guided me, a simple soldier for four years, through the hell of blood and fire. I cannot imagine that a true German would ever take the responsibility of leading his people through this hell a second time unless he was convinced that from this inferno a paradise would be forthcoming for his people. (Munich, April 9, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 12, 1927)

The Basis of Expansionism

As a people without power, the German people will, according to every indication, completely lose its position within the not-too-distant future. The German people will disappear from the earth; in fact, it will perish. This fateful question is the point of departure of our National Socialist doctrine, our *Weltanschauung*, and our teaching. We must try to seek out those bases for the existence of a people which alone are solid and real. And as a result of our investigation we come face to face with one single question. What is the relationship which the population has to the soil on which it lives?

Can the soil on which a people lives support the entire population for the time being, and is it sufficient to allow for a further increase in the population? Is the relationship between the soil and the population an impossible one? On the basis of this relationship, can it be predicted with mathematical certainty that either today or in the near future this people will not be able to support itself from this soil? This problem is of tremendous importance. No party, no government, no form of government nor any philosophical system can circumvent it. Under certain circumstances the attention of a people can in part be diverted from this problem by dogmatic queries and theories. Behind it all, however, there still remains a great and fateful question. Can you feed yourselves? In spite of all party dogmas and party principles the Goddess of misery will come and beat on the door of a

people which feel more and more the pain of want. A people slowly perishes if this want is not satisfied. . . .

From this standpoint there is only one hypothesis left for the German people, namely, that in this world population represents the changing element, while soil and territory represent an unchanging element. This means that at present soil and territory are limited in this world. Germany is the Fatherland of 62,000,000 people who live together on an area which is 450,000 kilometers square. This is a ridiculous figure when one considers the size of the other nations in the world today. This is especially noticeable when one looks at a globe map of the world on which Germany completely disappears. Unfortunately the great mass of our German people does not have the logical insight to draw the necessary conclusions from this fact. Instead, the great mass of our German people prefers to chase after certain phantoms. Moreover, the population can increase in a short time; it can perhaps reach 68,000,00 or 70,000,000, and yet the area on which it lives will remain the same. . . .

The only thing left for a people to do, then, is to attempt an adjustment in the relationship between the area on which it lives, that is, its reservoir of subsistence, and its population. The first method [limitation of the population] is the one which seems the easier. If we cannot expand the soil, then we decrease the population. There are certain parties in Germany who advocate this method. . . . Just a few weeks ago the "German" press announced that we had now received permission to send Germans to Canada again and that the first quota had actually been reached. It was said that this was an important and obvious success of our foreign policy. The success of German foreign policy, therefore, consists in chasing our best human material out of Germany.

The other way [to solve our problem] is to bring the soil into consonance with the population, even if it must be done by war. This is the natural way which Providence has prescribed. Providence has given the world unto man, not so that he should degenerate into pacifism, but so that in the eternal struggle with one another the strength and vigor of man should be preserved and so that some day the greatest freedom might belong to the most vigorous and most mighty people. The German people adopted this natural course a few times in its history, when, in trying to expand the soil in order to bring it into consonance with the population, it occupied the region southeast of the Rhine and then northeast of the Rhine, thus acquiring some territory for the German people. If this policy had not been fol-

lowed at that time our people today would constitute a ridiculously small state with a ridiculously small population.

The leaders of Germany can mull over the questions of the day as much as they like; they will always be confronted by a tremendous and fateful question. How can you adjust the relationship between the population and the soil; how can you revive the German people? . . .

We shall not be able to do anything about our fate until the German people again represent a factor of power (*Machtfactor*). If we concern ourselves with the question as to what constitutes the power of a people, we must hold to three things, all of which signify power. First, there is the might of a people which lies in military power. Second, a people represent a power factor when it possesses an abundance of soil, for, from the military point of view, power and strength are inherent in an area which is extensive. Even this, however, is lacking in our case. It is deplorable when one considers that it is possible to drive across Germany in scarcely sixty hours and that one can fly from border to border in barely four or five hours. Finally, there is a third factor which represents power. It is not population or soil but the inner strength of a people, namely energy, which constitutes steel-like power. The strength of a people is represented in the first place by the unity of a people in its thought and action. But, unfortunately, the inner unity of will and action is entirely absent from the German people today. (Berlin, May 1, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 5, 1927)

Subsistence Through Power

In the beginning of his speech our party comrade Rosenberg indicated that the most important problem for a nation was the adaptation of its space to the population. In this connection he revived the phrase "*Dem Volk den Raum!*" [Space for the people.] It is especially we Germans who know from our history how this phrase has determined and settled our suffering for centuries. We know too, that except for a comparatively short period in our history, we did not achieve the adaptation of the soil to the population. Today this question demands solution. No government, no matter what form or type, can in the long run avoid this issue.

The problem of the subsistence of a nation of 60,000,000 people compels us not only to preserve the basis of this subsistence for the future but to enlarge it in proportion to the increase in the population. The basis of this subsistence can lie in many fields. We espe-

cially as National Socialists must assert here and now that the most difficult problem with regard to the future of the European nations is not industrial production. It is moreover the realization of the fact that within the next few decades it will become increasingly more difficult to secure markets, and that some day matters will reach dead center when those countries which as yet are not regarded as industrial slowly submit to industrialization.

These countries, however, will still not be in a position to satisfy their needs with their own man-power. This in itself will at some future date cause complications in connection with foreign markets. And these complications will grow in proportion as they no longer affect one single country in Europe but a number of countries. It follows logically that the increasing competition will force these countries gradually to apply more and more severe methods. It will then be merely a question of time when the severity of the industrial struggle is replaced by the sharpness of the sword. Consequently, wherever a healthy nation stands face to face with this last alternative and in spite of great efficiency is no longer able to break this competition it will rely on the sword. For the question of subsistence is the question around which all life revolves. The question of subsistence then is a question of power.

The adaptation of the soil to the population is, therefore, the best way to a natural, wholesome, and lasting solution of this problem. In considering this problem we are led to the conclusion that the basis of its solution is power and again power. Power is also necessary to carry on economic struggle. . . . Power is the basis for the acquisition of soil and territory. . . .

If we investigate the concept of power more closely we will find that as far as a nation is concerned power lies in three factors. First there is the size of the population. This aspect of power is no longer represented by Germany. A nation of 62,000,000 does not represent a factor of power at a time when large territorial expanses with populations up to 400,000,000 become more and more active in world affairs and in addition employ a special kind of economic policy. If our population does not represent a factor of power we may turn to the second consideration—the factor of space. This, too, is no longer an element of power with us. In fact it seems ridiculously insignificant, for one can cross German territory with an aeroplane in scarcely four hours. Such an area does not provide protection in itself, as in the case of Russia where the territory alone represents a factor of power, that is, an assurance of safety.

If then these two bases of power—population and space—are not decisive in Germany, there remains the third factor of power—the inner strength of a people. A people can achieve great things if it can count this inner strength among its virtues. When, however, we examine the German people from this point of view, we must conclude to our dismay that this last factor of power is also not at hand. (Nuremberg, Aug. 21, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Aug. 23, 1927)

Soil Belongs to the Strong

The people represent a changeable unit, but the soil it occupies is invariable. A people grows, increases in numbers, and then comes into conflict with space, that is, with the soil which it occupies at the time. Soil and territory, especially under primitive conditions, are of decisive importance in a people's struggle for survival. Such a people will be compelled to bring the soil into consonance with the population. The attempt to achieve this congruity is known in reality as politics.

Every people will recognize in its growth and in the difficulty resulting therefrom the sacred right of acquiring that territory which alone will provide the daily bread for the increase in the population. To whom the Lord gives life, to him he will also give territory if he will but take it.

There is no right where soil and territory are concerned. Such is the world. Here you live; here you will die, and he who does not possess the courage and strength to live is ready for death. There is no higher justice which will provide daily bread for the weak. . . . For centuries the cry of our forefathers has rung out: Give us space! . . . The German people is crowded together on a hopelessly small area. He who looks into the future must reach the shocking conclusion that we, as a result of the size of our territory, are destined to extinction as a people if a change is not forthcoming in the relationship of the soil and population. (Munich, Nov. 21, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 23, 1927)

The Sword and the Plow

According to our point of view, all those things which have enabled man to rise above the animal world have their deepest roots, not in any sort of complicated mechanical and economic processes, but in the soil and territory. No concept, no political theory is sound which is not based on the principle that the existence of a people depends upon its

soil and territory. This is the foundation upon which a people can build. Everything else is merely the utilization of this foundation. When a people loses this basis, it is without roots; it then loses its affinity with the soil, and therewith the source of its strength as a people. A people who, even though it has been defeated, is supported by its soil will again draw new strength from its soil. The soil invigorates every people. A people which does not find its support in its soil and does not establish an affinity with its soil will perish miserably and wretchedly. . . .

As long as a people is cognizant of the fact that its existence is dependent on the correct relationship between the size of the population and the soil and territory, and as long as it realizes that the source of its subsistence lies in the soil, it will expand this soil and then colonize it. The expansion of the soil is the most primeval right, and it finds its expression in the struggle of the most natural class there is, namely the peasantry. As soon, however, as a people believes that it can correct the relationship of the population to the soil and territory by other means, it will lose its natural balance. Then, all those thousands of disturbances and obstructions to national life, under which we suffer today, will appear. For here too the principle applies that one false step will bring a thousand other false steps in its wake.

For centuries the German people has carried on the struggle for sufficient soil and territory. It is no accident that in all these centuries an attempt was made to bring the soil and territory into consonance with the number of our people, which, in the truest sense of the word, has been a peasant people with all the health and vigor found in an existence deeply rooted in the soil. Through the centuries our people has been vigorous like nature itself, for the struggle with the soil and exposure to the inclemencies of weather allow no dreamy fantastic theories of the Marxist-International type to develop. On the contrary, this struggle with the soil is by necessity an earnest struggle, carried on with firm resolution, with a belief in God on the one hand, and on the other trust in one's own fists. A people which stands on these sound foundations and principles will face all the problems of life with a healthy and natural instinct.

We have long since neglected this policy of the soil (*Bodenpolitik*) as the basis for the existence of our people. Land policy and agrarian policy (*Bauernpolitik*) have been shoved into the background and their place has been taken by an economy—by an industrial economy. And it is believed that this economy can supplant an agricultural

economy (*Bodenwirtschaft*), that a people can be supported by industry alone.

For forty years we Germans have been of the opinion that our future lies in commerce and industry, and that the attention of the people had begun to turn from the soil, a process which England, as our classic predecessor, had already lived through. In the same measure that England became an industrial state, English agriculture declined, the English peasant became impoverished, and completely disappeared. Today the British Empire is based on industry and export. It is now said by millions that this is also possible for us. These people forget, however, that they must buy a cheaper brand of foodstuffs from foreign countries, for which purpose England has her colonies. In this connection we National Socialists differ sharply with the present national policy, which will deprive our people of its roots because it rests on the conviction that industry can provide for the future of our people. We on the other hand are of the opinion that an industrial and export economy is the symptom of a disease, and that this kind of an economy cannot in the long run provide a people with the means of subsistence.

The products of the soil would have to support the entire people, while the production of industry would have to find its markets in the national economy, principally in agriculture. This exchange or equalization, which takes place through the medium of trade, would constitute a sound economy by which the existence of a people would be assured. With the adoption of this economy, the soil would again become the main basis of support of the nation. The nation has its roots in the soil, and its prosperity depends on the soil. Thus, the peasantry is not just an estate within the nation like any other, but one of the foundation stones of the whole people, and, to be sure, to such a degree that it continuously injects new strength into the other estates.

Our present economy declares that our people cannot be supported by itself, consequently it is necessary to export. Thus, this economy loses the balance between agricultural production (*Urproduction*) and industrial production. More is bought than is needed and, dear friends, when the general policy of a state adjusts itself to this system there is no restraint. Production rises, everyone races for markets, and then commerce pushes itself into the picture, and desires, in order to exist, as much export, as many markets, and as great a production as possible. The result is that a people is drawn more and more into its insane program.

We reproach the present political and economic policy: You have departed from the natural foundations of life—from the soil. You have done this because you think the other way is easier. You reject the idea of bringing the soil into consonance with the population because it requires power and must show results. You say that we want peace, that our people do not want war, but you deceive yourselves if you believe that you can carry on your policy of world trade (*Weltwirtschaftspolitik*) in peace. For the question around which things revolve today is not a question of production, but a question of markets and competition (*Konjunktur*). It is not just a question of export and import but a question of existence. In the same way that we Germans have more and more adjusted ourselves to this policy, so have other nations. In the same way that we have arranged our entire way of life so that we can no longer exist unless we export, regardless of the fact that millions must go hungry as a result, so other nations too are committed to this policy. And thus the question arises: Will all these nations find sufficient markets? We Germans say "No" . . . for the rest of the world has been in this business longer.

In the second place, our main competitor, England, has subjugated the greater part of the world politically and incorporated it into her colonial system. England has the markets and the sources of raw materials, and we are the interlopers. In order to compete we must produce cheaper and better. And so that the other nations do not lose their basis of existence—life itself, they will have to offer us opposition. This opposition then will be the new competitor, and if things do not work out, there will be new complications, and soon thereafter another war.

Land policy means building up the state upon the basis of its own soil. It means that the state is prepared to protect the soil, to protect production from the soil, and to protect the producer, namely, the peasant. There can be only one point of view here, either—or. Either a land policy, that is, protection of the soil and the peasantry and assuring the existence of a people from its own soil. Or, an economy of world trade which will someday again result in the collapse of this phantasy—as took place in 1918. The decisive factor, however, is once more the question of power.

If all the blood which our people has sacrificed had been shed for the purpose of expanding our soil and territory instead of plunging into a phantasy, then today we would not have become the carriers of culture throughout the world (*Kulturduenger der Welt*). We

would have a sound state based upon the peasantry (*Bauernstaat*) that would extend from here—from the Rhine—to Lithuania.

Wherein lies the power of a people? It lies in three factors. First, in the size of the population, which in our own case is not large enough. Second, in the area on which a people lives. For us this, too, is insufficient, because the present area upon which our people of 62,000,000 is now crowded scarcely covers 440,000 square kilometers. In the third place, power lies in the inner value of a people, in its inner worth *per se*, that is, in its spiritual virtue and its material accomplishments. This value is still with us. At the present time, however, it is buried beneath a rubbish heap of mere theories and phrases. But it is there, it has only to be sifted out. This value lies, first of all, in our racial heritage, in our blood. And we can proudly say that our German people, from the standpoint of race and blood, can be considered as among the best of its kind in existence.

Twice in history our people has drawn the sword to advantage. The first time, when our people colonized the south and east Marches with German peasants, and second, when they, here in the North, east of the Elbe, gained the territory which has been the most precious treasure of our people. If we had not promoted these great colonies and shed the blood which gained them, what would be the situation today? This colonization later returned a high rate of interest. The sword of those days has become the plow of today, and even today this plow assures a great part of our people its daily bread. If ever in the future of Germany the sword must be drawn, then not for any dream-like visions or any sort of crazy phantasies. If the sword must be drawn, then it must be drawn in the service of the plow—that is, for German soil—so that some day the time will come when the sword will again become the plow (Hamburg, March, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 18, 1928)

No Mere Revision of Frontiers

We admit that for us the future of Germany does not lie in a mechanical revision of frontiers. In such a case we would again be forced to rely upon world trade, which in turn would make us competitors of four or five other states. That is no future. The National Socialist Movement extends far beyond the deceitful level of such a philistine conception. It is the champion of that idea which claims that if we do not acquire more soil then we shall some day perish. We pursue no policy which will not secure the existence of the people for

all time. . . . I believe that I have enough energy to lead our people to war, and not for the revision of frontiers, but for the deliverance of our people in the most distant future, so that our people acquires so much soil and territory that the sacrifice in blood can be returned to posterity in four-fold measure. (Munich, May 23, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 25, 1928)

Territorial Aggrandizement

How are we going to feed this rapidly growing nation? Two ways are open—either by the acquisition of more space or by the application of a more intensive economy. In both cases power is necessary to find a favorable solution of Germany's plight.

If today the Treaty of Versailles were set aside Germany would find herself in the same position as in 1914. Again the whole world, as on August 5th of that year, would be lined up against her, because the competition of Germany would deprive other people of their daily bread. We are constantly confronted with this vital question: Can the German nation subsist within the borders of its present territory? If the German people require more living space, then power is necessary. If a more intensive economy is the solution, then again, this can only be accomplished with the help of power. There are [in Germany] 20,000,000 too many and our struggle is concerned with these 20,000,000. Fate must decide the issue. Whatever the solution might be, power and again power is necessary in order to solve this vital question of the German people. It cannot be solved by the elimination of the Versailles Treaty, a very ridiculous assumption under the present circumstances. (Munich, Sept. 22, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 23/24, 1928)

Might Is Right

If the German people does not solve the problem of its lack of space, and if it does not open up the domestic market for its industry, then 2,000 years have been in vain. Germany will then make its exit from the world stage and peoples with more vigor will come into our heritage. . . .

There is no historical injustice where soil is concerned, just as there is no historical injustice in possession. Possession must be gained by work and then it exists by right. Space must be fought for and maintained. People who are lazy have no right to the soil. Soil is for

him who tills it and protects it. If a people disclaims soil, it disclaims life. If a nation loses in the defense of its soil then the individual loses. There is no higher justice that decrees that a people must starve. There is only power, which creates justice. . . .

Parliaments do not create all of the rights on this earth; force also creates rights. The question is whether we wish to live or die. We have more right to soil than all the other nations because we are so thickly populated. I am of the opinion that in this respect too the principle can be applied: God helps him who helps himself. (Berlin, May 5, 1930; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 7, 1930)

The Misunderstood "German Question"

In view of the fact that the outside world often speaks of a "German Question," it is worthwhile to obtain an objective and clear understanding of this problem. For many, this "question" is to be found in the present German regime, in the misunderstood difference between the German regime and other regimes, in the so-called threatening "rearmaments" and in all that *Fata Morgana* which supposedly has resulted from this rearmament. For others, this question lies in the alleged militarist intentions of the German people, in the latent desire for aggression or in the satanic efficiency with which they are capable of getting the better of their opponents.

No, my dear political dabblers, the German question is something quite different. Here, 67,000,000 people live in a very restricted area, the land of which is not everywhere fertile. This means about 136 persons to each square kilometer. These people are no less industrious than other European peoples and no less pretentious in their will to live. . . . In regard to territory, Russia has eighteen times more land per capita than Germany. It is understood, therefore, that the struggle for existence and daily bread is difficult. Without the ability and industry of the German peasant and the organizing capacity of the German nation, existence would hardly be conceivable for these 67,000,000. What is to be said, however, of the mental simplicity of those who perhaps recognize these difficulties and yet take such childish delight in them in speeches, the press, and other publications? Not only that, but they even seek out every symptom of distress in Germany in order to be able to shout triumphantly about it to the rest of the world. Apparently they would be happier if our distress were even greater, if we were unable, through our industry and intelligence, to make our situation bearable. They do not seem to have the least idea

that the German question would take on quite a different aspect if the efficiency and industry of these millions should become paralyzed and if therewith not only poverty and misery but also political madness should make its appearance in Germany. This is one of the German questions. The world should be interested in seeing that this question of assuring the livelihood of the German people from year to year is successfully solved. In like manner I wish the German people to understand and to appreciate that it lies in their innermost interests to have the same vital questions successfully solved in the case of other peoples.

The solution of this question in Germany is the concern of the German people themselves and need not interest the rest of the world. It touches the interest of other nations only insofar as the German people is forced in the solution of this question to resume trade relations as buyers and sellers with the rest of the world. It would be to the advantage of the rest of the world if it would understand this question and realize that the cry for bread on the part of a nation of forty, fifty, or sixty millions is not a deliberate evil engineered by a regime or by certain forms of government, but that it is the natural expression of the will to live. It ought to be quite clear that contented people are more reasonable than hungry people and that governments should not only be interested in seeing that their own people get enough to eat but also the people of surrounding states. It is in the interests of all that each nation be enabled, in the highest sense of the term, to fulfill the conditions necessary for its existence. Before the war the opposite opinion still held sway and was even proclaimed as a reason for war. This opinion specifically held that one part of the European family of nations would fare all the better if the other part fared worse.

The German nation needs no special aid to fulfill its own way of life. It will not be content, however, with the possession of opportunities which are inferior to those granted to other people. This is only one phase of the German question.

The second phase follows. As a result of exceptionally unfavorable general conditions, the struggle for economic existence in Germany is extremely difficult, while the intelligence and industry of the people and consequently the standard of life natural to them is very high. Therefore an exceptional effort on the part of all the forces of the nation is necessary in order to master this first German problem. Such an effort can be made only if the German nation feels itself on a footing of political equality with other nations, and thus politically secure.

It is impossible to hold a people of honor and bravery in a perpetual state of helotry or even under such conditions to govern them. There is no better proof of the innate love of peace of the German people than the fact that, despite its ability and courage, which can scarcely be questioned by its opponents, and in spite of its large population, the German nation has secured for itself only such a modest share of the world's living space and the world's goods. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

The Causes of World War II

We are involved in a conflict in which more than the victory of only one country or the other is at stake; it is rather a war of two opposing worlds. I shall try to give you . . . an insight into the essential reasons underlying this conflict. I shall, however, confine myself to Western Europe only. The peoples who are primarily affected—85,000,000 Germans, 46,000,000 Britishers, 45,000,000 Italians, and about 37,000,000 Frenchmen—are the cores of the states which were or are still opposed in war. If I make a comparison between the living conditions of these peoples the following facts become evident. Forty-six million Britishers dominate and govern approximately 16,000,000 square miles of the surface of the earth. Thirty-seven million Frenchmen dominate and govern a combined area of approximately 4,000,000 square miles. Forty-five million Italians possess, taking into consideration only those territories in any way capable of being utilized, an area scarcely 190,000 square miles. Eighty-five million Germans possess as their living space scarcely 232,000 square miles. That is to say, 85,000,000 Germans own only 232,000 square miles on which they must live their lives and 46,000,000 Britishers possess 16,000,000 square miles. . . .

This world has not been so divided up by Providence or Almighty God. This allocation has been made by man himself. The land was parcelled out for the most part during the last 300 years, that is, during the period in which, unfortunately, the German people were helpless and torn by internal dissension. Split up into hundreds of small states in consequence of the Treaty of Muenster at the end of the Thirty Years' War, our people frittered away their entire strength in internal strife. Princes and princelings, kings and high ecclesiastics maintained disunion among our people. When it finally appeared as if this purely dynastic laceration of our country might come to an end, the dissension and confusion was perpetuated by political parties

which appeared on the scene, and by false ideologies. While during this period the Germans, notwithstanding their particular ability among the people of Western Europe, dissipated their powers in vain internal struggles, the division of the world proceeded beyond their borders. It was not by treaties or by binding arguments, but exclusively by the use of force that Britain forged her gigantic Empire.

The second people that failed to receive their fair share in this distribution, namely the Italians, experienced and suffered a similar fate. Torn by internal conflicts, devoid of unity, split up into numerous small states, this people also dissipated all their energy in internal strife. Nor was Italy able to obtain even the natural position in the Mediterranean which was her due. Thus in comparison with others, these two powerful peoples have received much less than their fair share. The objection might be raised: Is this really of decisive importance?

Man does not exist on theories and phrases, on declarations or on systems of political philosophy. He lives on what he can gain from the soil by his own labor in the form of food and raw materials. This is what he can eat, this is what he can use for manufacture and production. If a man's own living conditions offer him too little, his life will be wretched. We see that within the countries themselves, fruitful areas afford better living conditions than poor barren lands. In the one case there are flourishing villages; in the other poverty-stricken communities. A man may live on a stony desert or in a fruitful land of plenty. This handicap can never be fully overcome by theories, nor even by the will to work.

We see that the primary cause for the existing tensions lies in the unfair distribution of the riches of the earth. It is only natural that evolution follows the same rule in the larger framework as it does in the case of individuals. Just as the tension existing between rich and poor within a country must be compensated for either by reason or often, if reason fails, by force, so in the life of a nation one cannot claim everything and leave nothing to others.

Providence did not place man on earth with the idea that one should claim for himself fifty or eighty times his neighbor's portion. Either he is reasonable and agrees to an equitable settlement, or the one who is oppressed and crushed by misfortune will sooner or later seize that to which he is entitled. That holds good for individuals as well as for nations. The great task to which I set myself in internal affairs was to bring reason to bear on the problems, to eliminate dangerous tensions by invoking the common sense of all, to bridge the

gulf between excessive riches and poverty. I recognize, of course, that such processes cannot be consummated overnight. It is always preferable to bring together widely separated classes gradually and by the exercise of reason, rather than to resort to a solution based on force.

The right to live is a common and equal right. Therefore, it is not fair for a people to say it is willing to let others go on shifting for themselves. It is the essence of any really socialist system to see, not that alms are distributed but that rights are established. It is not a question of giving alms as a matter of charity to nations who have not received their fair share, but of granting them their rights, just as men receive theirs in ordinary daily life. The claim to the right to live is not a request for charity, but a lawful and fundamental claim. The right to live, therefore, is at the same time a just claim to the soil which alone is the source of life. When unreasonableness threatened to choke their development, nations fought for this sacred claim. No other course was open to them and they realized that even bloodshed and sacrifice are better than the gradual extinction of a nation. . . .

How can our people, with its 360 persons per square mile, exist at all if it does not employ every ounce of brain power and physical strength to wrest from its soil what it needs? This distinguishes us from the others. In Canada, for example, there are 2.6 persons per square mile; in other countries perhaps 16, 18, 20 or 26 persons. Well, no matter how stupidly one managed one's affairs in such a country, a decent living would still be possible. Here in Germany, however, there are 360 persons per square mile. The others cannot manage with twenty-six persons per square mile, but we must manage with 360. This is the task we face. That is why I expressed this view in 1933. We must solve these problems and, therefore, we will solve them. (Berlin, Dec. 10, 1940; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 11, 1940)

3

Democracy, Pacifism and Internationalism

A people that is subject to the decision of the majority is destined for destruction.

Munich, Oct. 30, 1923

Pacifism is the deadly poison of the nations.

Lemgo, Jan. 12, 1933

Hitler's tirades against democracy, pacifism and internationalism—as one and the same evil—have been calculated to achieve clear-cut Nazi ends. By undermining the validity of these concepts, he has channelized the nation's policy along expansionist lines. By identifying the same ideas with Germany's defeat and humiliation in 1918, he has simultaneously glorified the principles of force and power. Finally, by ridiculing Western idealism he has discredited the Weimar Republic and justified his own dictatorship.

The Fuehrer's relentless campaign against democracy has proceeded in part from his racial principles. Stigmatized as a Jewish concoction, democracy has been ruled out as un-German. Moreover, equalitarianism has been denounced as a threat to German blood and racial purity. Scarcely less effective, particularly among the upper classes, has been Hitler's insistence that democracy offers the ideal breeding ground for Bolshevism.

Significantly enough, Hitler insisted on his civil rights under the Weimar Republic. No one endeavored to evoke democratic justice and liberty more than he when, prior to 1933, the Voelkischer Beobachter was intermittently restricted or his speeches banned. Once he became Chancellor, however, he destroyed civil liberties and denied to others the same democratic rights he himself had demanded and enjoyed.

In the field of foreign affairs, Hitler has replaced the international ideal with fanatic nationalism. His whole program has been predicated on the principle of German superiority and German dominance. His antagonism toward "world peace" and "world solidarity" is one redson why Europe's destiny is now being forged in the crucible of war.

Although the Fuehrer has sneered at the international tradition, he has exploited it at every opportunity. His campaign against the Versailles Treaty, his demand for equality, his pleas for self-determination, his withdrawal of Germany from the League of Nations, and his assertion that President Roosevelt instigated World War II—all these he has defended on the basis of his interpretation of international law and justice.

Willing enough to resort to the international code if he could profit thereby, Hitler has disregarded it completely when it has suited his purposes. In short he has devised his own international law—the law of National Socialist necessity.

Democracy Is Jewish Domination

Democracy is Jewish domination, for the people do not rule; public opinion is manufactured by the press, which is owned by Jews. At the same time democracy is not an end in itself, but the means to an end. The end is the achievement of Jewish domination through education for democracy—that is, through the creation of a lethargic mass of people who thinks that it rules through its elected representatives. The achievement of Jewish domination is facilitated by the determination of a minority and the cowardice of the majority in the ranks of the middle class, where, in addition, a great deal is accomplished by the threat of terror. . . .

Parliaments will not help the German people. We can hope for a change in our predicament only when we realize that the Jewish Revolution of 1918 was made by a small determined group, which, like shocktroops, swept the broad lethargic majority with it. That is the way great changes have always been accomplished. In realization of this Bismarck as a single individual once raised up the German people. We National Socialists want to adopt this "political" law of nature and want to be the shocktroops which will guide the destiny of the nation in order to lead it out of depression into a better future. It is our task to gather about us those dissatisfied with parliamentarianism in order to give our people the place it deserves. (Munich, Oct. 1, 1922; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 1, 1922)

Toward a Fighting Germany

An individual who says, I refuse to defend my life, has forfeited the right to his existence. To be a pacifist implies a lack of conviction and a lack of character. For, though the pacifist relies on the help of others, he refuses to defend himself on his own behalf. This holds equally true when applied to a people. A people that is not prepared to defend itself lacks character. We must again reawaken our people to a recognition of one of the most elementary principles. A man is only he who protects and defends himself like a man; and a people is a people only when it is willing, when necessary, as a people to fight on the field of battle. That is not militarism, that is self-preservation.

We National Socialists, therefore, advocate compulsory military service for everyone. If a state is not worth that, then away with it. But then do not complain if you are enslaved. If, however, you think

that you must be free, then you must learn to realize that no one will give you freedom—that it must be won with your own sword. Our people is not in need of leaders of the parliamentary ilk, but of leaders who are determined to carry through—if necessary against the majority—that which they themselves have recognized as the truth before God, the world, and their own conscience. If we succeed in getting such leaders from the ranks of our people, then a new nation will crystallize around them. . . . It is the pride of our Movement to be the herald of a fighting Germany of the future. (Munich, April 27, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29/30, 1923)

Internationalism Is Weakness

Internationalism is weakness in the life of nations. What is there that is born of internationalism? Nothing. The real values of human culture were not born of internationalism, but they were created by the whole heritage and tradition of the people (*das Volkstum*). When peoples no longer possess creative power they become international. Wherever there is weakness in regard to spiritual matters in the life of nations, internationalism makes its appearance. It is no coincidence that a people, namely, the Jews, which does not have any real creative ability is the carrier of this internationalism. It is the people with the least creative power and talent. It dominates only in the field of crooked and speculative economy.

The Jew, as a race, has a remarkable instinct of self-preservation, but as an individual he has no cultural abilities at all. He is the demon of the disintegration of nations—the symbol of continual destruction of peoples. If the first of May, therefore, is to have any meaning in the life of peoples, it can be only a glorification of the national, creative idea as against the international idea of decay. (Munich, May 1, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 3, 1923)

National Socialist Weltanschauung

The *Weltanschauung* of pacifism and democracy which today directs the destiny of our people has brought us to the place where, instead of being the most powerful people on earth, we have become a colony of serfs and slaves, not only physically but also spiritually. Our people can earn the chance to acquire the means of another rejuvenation through a *Weltanschauung* completely contrary to the one mentioned above. The National Socialists have made this *Weltanschauung*

their own, and they are determined to build the new Reich upon this basis.

We are enemies of cowardly pacifism because we recognize that according to the laws of nature struggle is the father of all things. We are enemies of democracy because we recognize that an individual genius represents at all times the best in his people and that he should be the leader. Numbers can never direct the destiny of a people. Only genius can do this. We are the deadly enemies of internationalism because nature teaches us that the purity of race and the authority of the leader alone are able to lead a nation to victory. (Kulmbach, Feb. 5, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 9, 1928)

Long Live Fanatical Nationalism

Our entire work consists of enlightening our people, of reshaping its mentality. It consists in the creation of a new Movement which will reform our people from top to bottom even reaching into the soul of the common German man, a new Movement which establishes three great postulates without which foreign policy cannot be carried out in the future.

In the first place, our people must be delivered from the hopeless confusion of international convictions, and educated consciously and systematically to fanatical nationalism. We will not declare that our goal is to have the German people sing German songs again in the future. No, our goal is that the German people should again acquire honor and conviction, that it should again bow in adoration before its own history, that it should respect those things which formerly gave it significance, and that it should curse that which damaged its honor. We recognize only two Gods: A God in Heaven and a God on earth and that is our Fatherland.

Second, insofar as we educate the people to fight against the delirium of democracy and bring it again to the recognition of the necessity of authority and of leadership, we tear it away from the nonsense of parliamentarianism; thereby we deliver it from the atmosphere of irresponsibility and lead it to responsibility and to a recognition of duty on the part of the individual person.

Third, insofar as we deliver the people from the atmosphere of pitiable belief in possibilities which lie outside the bounds of one's own strength—such as the belief in reconciliation, understanding, world peace, the League of Nations, and international solidarity—we

destroy these ideas. There is only one right in this world and this right is one's own strength.

The people must recognize that its future will not be moulded through cowardly belief in the help of others but through faithful devotion to one's own task. Out of this devotion deliverance must one day come—freedom and happiness and life. (Munich, Sept. 22, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 23, 1928)

Racial and National Regeneration

He who shows his fist to the German people, his fist we will break open, and we will force him to be our brother. He who does not want to be a German has no place in our ranks. We are going to see to it that in this state there will be 60,000,000 who will not say in the first line of their political creed: "I am a democrat," or "I am a member of the People's Party," but who will say "I am a German."

Racial degeneration continues apace. The bastardization of great states has begun. The negroization of culture, of customs—not only of blood—strides forward. The world becomes democratized. The value of the individual declines. The masses apparently are gaining the victory over the idea of the great leader. Numbers are chosen as the new God.

The poison of pacifism is again scattered about. The world forgets that struggle is the father of all things. State upon state is becoming intoxicated with ideas that must lead to the obliteration of a people. When the bastard, however, stands against the thoroughbred, and the negro stands against the white man, the one who from the racial standpoint is the strongest, will be victorious. The individual is creative and has given culture to the world. When cowardice is pitted against courage and pacifism against daring, courage and daring gain the victory. That state will be victorious which does not fall prey to the vice of cowardice and pacifism. The people who oppose pacifism with the idea of struggle will with mathematical certainty become the master of its fate.

A people who opposes the bastardization of its spirit and its blood can be saved. The German people has its specific value and cannot be placed on the same level as 70,000,000 negroes. If the German people will recognize its value it can mold the forces which will lead to victory.

Negro music is now the rage. But if we put the shimmy alongside a Beethoven symphony, then the triumph is clear. Let us think

about the German soul, and then faith, creative power, and tenacity will not fail. Our people has always found men who conquered distress. Now it is believed, however, that leaders can be dispensed with; and at present world history is not being made, but, rather, the history of submission. Out of our strong faith will come the strength to help ourselves against this bastardization.

The goal which the National Socialist German Workers Party has set up for itself is to divest the terms nationalism and socialism of their former meaning. A nationalist can only be he who stands for his people, and a socialist can only be he who intercedes for the rights of his people—also in the field of foreign affairs. . . . This Movement begins a gigantic struggle against internationalism with all its effects to the left as well as to the right. All peoples on this earth are a matter of indifference to us, but in relation to one people we are full of passionate love, namely, in relation to our own people. . . . We fight against the idea of numbers and the delirium of the masses. We want to see those who are superior take the reins of government in their hands. There are 100,000 among us for whom voting is of no consequence—only the authority of the leader. And these 100,000 know that democracy in itself is a deception. (Berlin, Nov. 17, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 21, 1928)

World Discord Is Germany's Opportunity

We Germans have no reason to wish, even in the slightest degree, that through events, no matter of what nature they might be, a so-called "World Peace" should be preserved which makes possible, indeed confirms . . . the most terrible plundering and extortion as the only possible fate for our people. If a victor of superior strength expresses a desire for rest after a hard war that is understandable. The tiger needs time to devour his victim. But that the victim should also wish that the tiger should not be disturbed in the act of devouring him is an unnatural desire. It is insanity of the type that could only spring from the brains of the diplomats of our foreign office and the good-for-nothing heads of our parliamentarians.

Germany can have only one ardent wish, namely, that the spirit of misfortune should hover over every conference, that discord should arise therefrom, and that finally a world peace which would otherwise ruin our nation should dissolve in blood and fire. And one can hope that out of this struggle the possibility might arise for Germany to enter upon the stage of world historical events as a performer. To

achieve this purpose the preliminary destruction of that German party-government in internal affairs would by all means be necessary—that party-government which first disarmed our people in respect to its technical weapons and which today keeps on disarming and destroying the people in respect to its moral and ethical values. (*Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 29, 1930)

The Destruction of Democracy

X We National Socialists know that no election can conclusively decide the fate of a nation. It is not parliamentary majorities that mold the fate of nations. At best they can only ruin the fate of nations. We know, however, that in this election democracy must be defeated with the weapons of democracy. That is why we are entering into this election with all the energy that we possess; that is why in the next few weeks we will fight on from one end of Germany to the other. . . .

Here is a Movement that represents no interests except those of the German nation in its entirety, a Movement that fights for three fundamental principles: for the reestablishment of German national strength and the removal of all influences of a poisonous, pestiferous, or international nature; for the destruction of the principle of the majority, of madness and half-measures, and the restoration of the principle of authority and the genius of leadership; for the destruction of cowardly submission, self-degradation, self-accusation, self-abandonment, and the reestablishment of the will to resist in the entire German people . . . If this Movement should achieve victory, internationalism, democracy, and pacifism will vanish in Germany and then the German people will rise up. (Munich, July 18, 1930; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, July 20, 1930)

The Mediocrity of Numbers

In all ages it was not democracy that created values, it was individuals. However, it was always democracy that ruined and destroyed individuality. It is madness to think and criminal to proclaim that a majority can suddenly replace the accomplishment of a man of genius. . . . Every people must see in its most capable men the greatest national value, for this is the most lasting value there is. One single inventor, one genius, can mean more for a people than hundreds of millions or even a billion in capital.

Nations have always gone to ruin on the principle of democracy. If Germany has declined in the last fourteen years, it is because the advocacy of the principle of democracy had gone so far that its patrons and representatives in Germany were actually subject to the mediocrity of numbers, whose very sovereignty they preached. They themselves had become so inferior, so puny and dwarfish, that they did not even possess the right to lift themselves above the masses. There has never yet been a regime or a government which gave up the ghost in a more dismal, more lamentable, and more inferior manner than the representatives of the recent system. (Berlin, March 2, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 3, 1933)

Parliamentary Perversion

In that we deny the principle of parliamentary democracy we strike the strongest blow for the right of the nation to the self-determination of its own life. For in the parliamentary system we see no genuine expression of the nation's will—a will which cannot logically be anything else than a will to the maintenance of the nation—but we do see a distortion, if not a perversion, of that will. The will of a nation to the self-determination of its being manifests itself most clearly and is of most use when its most capable minds are brought forth. They form the representative leaders of a nation, they alone can be the pride of a nation—certainly never the parliamentary politician who is the product of the ballot box and thinks only in terms of votes. The constructive development of the future leadership of the nation through its most able men will take years; the intelligent education of the German people will take decades. (Nuremberg, Sept. 1, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 2, 1933)

Democratic Dictatorship

From the Anglo-Saxon countries I often hear expressions of regret that Germany should have departed from just those principles of democratic government which such countries consider as specially sacred. This opinion is based upon a serious error. Germany too has a "democratic" constitution. The present German Government of the National Socialist State has also been elected by the people and feels itself in the same way responsible to the people. It does not matter how many votes a deputy must have in the individual countries. There are countries which consider 20,000 votes necessary for a deputy,

others consider 10 or 5,000 sufficient, while in others again the number is 60,000 or more.

The German people has elected a single deputy as its representative with 38,000,000 votes. This is perhaps one of the most important differences between our conditions and those existing in other countries. It means that I feel myself just as responsible to the German people as would any Parliament. I act on the trust it has placed in me and I carry out its mandate. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

The Intellectual Cause of Anarchy

The prerequisite for the development of every community is and remains the surrender of the unlimited freedom of the individual in favor of binding duties and obligations owed to the whole. As long as mankind exists there will always be a contradiction between the seemingly unlimited freedom of the individual and the lack of freedom which is imposed for the sake of the whole. The unlimited freedom of the individual prevents the formation of any large community and thus in truth renders the seemingly free individual the helpless victim of the severity of the struggle for existence in this world.

The organization of larger communities demands, at the outset, the surrender of unbridled individual freedom. As a result, however, of the performance achieved by the whole and of the better security thus afforded to the whole, the individual is offered a higher and protected standard of living. And this is what is necessary for any form of human culture, yes, for the superior position of mankind in this world.

Every successful attempt to achieve the practical realization of unlimited individual freedom leads to anarchy. The organized grouping of individuals, however, by means of the limitation of the freedom of the individual in favor of the organization of a greater community leads to the state. Thus the *sine qua non* for the state, and the basis of the existence of the state, is and always will be the authority embodied in the will to the maintenance of the state.

Democracy is the intellectual cause of anarchy and, indeed, the intellectual basis of anarchy in every shape. No state owes its origin to present-day democracy, though all great empires have gone to ruin on this form of democracy. Indeed, the final excesses of this type of democracy must lead to anarchism, just as authority, or better the principle of authority, must in the final analysis lead again to the state, that is, to a higher order of the community.

It is clear that every higher order of the community is only then rational, yes, tolerable, when the authoritarian will which prevails in it proceeds from those who are qualified to exercise this will and are of the same blood as the community itself. It is further clear that just as any gift with which man is endowed must be developed, so must the form of the community that men inherit be continually fought for and thus earned anew. Just as states did not develop from the democratic principle of the unlimited freedom of the individual, so they cannot be maintained by means of concessions in this direction. That which required struggle and hardship for its development cannot be maintained by submission and weakness.

Organization developed at the expense of unlimited individual freedom. It is no wonder that in all weak epochs this same unlimited freedom which has been subjected and shackled should seek to regain its original state. By means of democracy the states have opened up the easiest road to this retrograde development of their own being. Such a road can end only in anarchism, in the dissolution of all human communities. . . . With the victory of National Socialism the play of unrestricted forces introduced by democracy was ended. (Nuremberg, Sept. 9, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 10, 1936)

Ideological Enemies

If anyone has reason to complain about the intolerance of ideas, then we have. Repeatedly we experience attacks from the camps of our ideological enemies, simply for the reason that Germany, National Socialist Germany, takes other paths than those which our opponents in foreign politics choose to consider correct.

What business is it of democracy that National Socialism governs in Germany? It does not need to tolerate National Socialism in its own countries, just as we in Germany reject any more democracy. These countries ought to recognize at last that the German nation had opportunity enough for fifteen years before the National Socialist regime to learn to know in a practical way the ideas of the western democracies, which are supposed to bring about international brotherhood and happiness to humanity.

It is a matter of complete indifference to us National Socialists whether we are loved or hated by these democracies, whether they regard us as equals or not. The German people in fifteen long years completely lost its respect for democracy and the fraternal effects of its true sentiments. Germany today stands ninety-nine per cent in the

camp of national authoritarianism. The German people has no desire to recall in any way the memories of these honest and supposedly necessary sympathies which world democracy gave to the democratic Germany of that time. We have forgotten this and the world should be glad!

It is not surprising, therefore, that when the democracies continually shower us with their antipathy, we naturally feel a greater sympathy for the authoritarian countries. The grounds for this particular sympathy lie, however, in the fact that despite all the indifference of democracy toward its peculiar ideas of state, we believe we recognize a mode of life in democracy which never was a permanent condition, but which was always only transitory and which—we fear—will always remain such. . . .

Democracy visibly breaks down the European states, makes them internally unsure in judging real dangers, and, above all, cripples all determined resistance. Democracy is the channel through which Bolshevism sends its poisons into the individual countries to let them take effect there until these infections lead to a dulling of insight and to a weakening of the powers of resistance. (Nuremberg, Sept. 14, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 15, 1936)

The Democracy of National Socialism

May we not speak of a revolution when the chaotic conditions brought about by parliamentary democracy disappear in less than three months and a regime of order and discipline takes their place, when a new energy springs forth from a firmly welded unity and a comprehensive authoritative power such as Germany never before had?

So great was the revolution that its intellectual foundations are not even yet understood but are superficially criticized by our contemporaries. They talk of democracies and dictatorships; but they fail to grasp the fact that in this country a radical transformation has taken place and has produced results which are democratic in the highest sense of the word, if democracy has any meaning at all.

With infallible certainty we are steering towards an order of things in which a process of selection will become active in the political leadership of the nation, as it exists throughout the whole of life in general. By this process of selection, which will follow the laws of nature and the dictates of human reason, those among our people who show the greatest natural ability will be appointed to positions in the

political leadership of the nation. In making this selection no consideration will be given to birth or ancestry, name or wealth, but only to the question of whether or not the candidate has a natural aptitude for those higher positions of leadership. That was a fine principle which the great Corsican enunciated when he said that each one of his soldiers carried a marshal's baton in his haversack. In this country that principle will have its political counterpart. Is there a nobler or more excellent kind of Socialism and is there a truer form of democracy than this National Socialism which is so organized that through it each one among the millions of German boys is given the possibility of finding his way to the highest office in the nation, should it please Providence to come to his aid.

And that is no theory. In the present National Socialist Germany it is a reality that is considered by us all as a matter of course. I myself, to whom the people have given their trust and who have been called to be their leader, come from the people. All the millions of German workers know that it is not a foreign dilettante or an international revolutionary apostle who is at the head of the Reich, but a German who has come from their own ranks. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1937)

The League of Nations—Institution of Injustice

Recently it has again and again been rumored that Germany was about to revise her views concerning a possible return into the League of Nations. Notwithstanding the danger that the journalists of the democratic world press, who are as dense as they are indolent, may by tomorrow have forgotten again what I am about to say, I should like to state once more the following. In the year 1919 there was imposed on several nations a treaty of peace which involved violent interference with national communities and property rights, to an extent hitherto inconceivable. The violence done to national and economic life, the tearing asunder of national communities took place behind a smoke screen of moral phrases which were perhaps good enough to soothe the bad consciences of the perpetrators, but which seemed to the victims to be only a bad joke. After this act of violence had completely and decisively altered the map of the world, from a territorial as well as from a demographic point of view, a League of Nations was founded whose future task was to make permanent this insane and unreasonable action as a final conclusion to the political and economic development of the nations and to fix the results of the treaty as the

eternal and unalterable foundation for the life and boundaries of human communities on this planet. In the future no one was to seek to change by force what had arisen through force. But in order to mitigate somewhat the insanity of such an atrocious violation of humanity, the possibility was at least kept open that in the future this violent reorganization of what had arisen through thousands of years might be modified in a legal, that is to say, reasonable way. This somewhat difficult task was, then, incidentally as it were, assigned to the League of Nations.

Germany herself had, to begin with, no right at all to join this noble society for the moral defense of former acts of violence, but only received the gracious permission to do so through the memorable Reich Chancellor, Gustav Stresemann. Now you know what a failure this institution has been. It never was a League of Nations, for from the very beginning one of the greatest powers in the world [America] did not belong to it, while yet another important power [Japan] resigned later. Neither was it an institution of justice nor yet, as is still maintained today with astonishing effrontery, an institution for the maintenance of a state of things which has arisen from the injustice of a thousand years. For either might is right, or might is wrong.

But, if might is wrong today, then might was wrong in the past. If, therefore, the present condition of the world has arisen through might, and there is no doubt that this is so, then this condition is one which was produced by a wrong. The League of Nations does not, therefore, defend a condition of right, but one born of a thousand years of wrong. We do, indeed, hear that all this is to be changed. We often hear, for instance, that English politicians would be only too delighted to give us back our colonial possessions if they did not suffer so much from the thought of all the wrong and violence which the natives would thereby undergo. In the year 1918, when the League of Nations had not yet come into existence, it was quite possible to hand over these territories to their new owners without the consent of the natives, in order later to have this transfer morally confirmed by the League of Nations. To be sure, if one were to extend this noble principle—that a colony may only belong to the owner expressly desired by the natives—to the past history of colonial acquisitions, the colonial possessions of the world powers would probably be seriously diminished. All these colonial empires have in fact not come about through plebiscites, much less democratic plebiscites, of the people living in them, but have been acquired by naked and brutal force.

They are today, of course, inseparable parts of the states in question and as such form a part of that world order which is always represented to us, by democratic politicians in particular, as the "World Order of Law"—of that "law" which the League of Nations exists to protect. I quite understand that those who have an interest in the maintenance of this legal order see in the League of Nations a convenient moral forum for the maintenance of, and, if necessary, the defense of the possessions which they formerly acquired by force. But what I do not understand is that the nation which has itself been robbed by such an act of force should in its turn become a member of this illustrious society. And I must protest against the accusation that we are not ready to stand for the principles of law because we are not in the League of Nations, because we believe that it is not an institution of justice, but rather an institution for the defense of the wrong done at Versailles.

There are in addition a series of objective considerations. We left the League of Nations at the time because, true to the principles of its birth and constitution, it denied us the right to equal armaments and therewith equal security. We shall never join it again, because we have no intention of being involved in the defense of injustice in some part of the world by a majority decision of the League. We believe that we are thereby doing a service to all those nations which are so unfortunate as to rely on the League as a factor of real assistance.

In the case of the Abyssinian conflict, for instance, we should have held it better to have had, to begin with, more understanding for Italy's vital needs, and secondly to have given the Abyssinians less hope and, above all, fewer promises. This would perhaps have made possible a simpler and more reasonable solution of the whole problem.

If the worst should come to the worst, we have no intention of allowing the German nation to be drawn into conflicts in which our own interests are not involved. We are not willing to stand up for the territorial or economic interests of other nations if Germany obtains no visible advantage thereby. In addition we do not ourselves expect support of this kind from other nations. Germany is resolved to impose upon herself a wise restriction in her interests and demands. But if German interests should anywhere be seriously at stake, we shall not expect assistance from a League of Nations, but shall straightway assume that we shall have to do what is necessary ourselves. And it is as well to be clear about this, for it will always impose on our wishes and hopes that moderation which we often unfortunately fail to see among those who enjoy collective security.

Finally, we do not intend in the future to allow an attitude to be prescribed for us by an international institution whose actions do not resemble those of a reasonable human being, but those of the ostrich. Since the League of Nations is itself obviously incapable of understanding historical or economic necessities and of fulfilling the demands based on them, and since on the other hand the essential interests of nations are in the long run stronger than formal considerations, a peculiar situation would arise if it were to continue for a hundred years. For it is very probable that in the year 2036 new states will have risen, or others have disappeared, without it having been possible to register this new situation at Geneva.

Germany was once compelled by her membership in the League to associate herself with such unreasonable action; she was, thank Heaven, as a result of leaving it, able to act in accordance with reason and justice. But I make known to you today that I have now decided to make the necessary correction in respect to the first case.

Germany will recognize Manchukuo. By deciding to take this step we make a final break between a policy which is fantastic and incomprehensible, and one which implies a sober respect for real facts. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

Bolshevism—Ally of Democracy

That which in other countries is called democracy, is in most cases nothing more than a hoodwinking of public opinion, achieved through clever press and money manipulation and a shrewd use of the results thus achieved. How wholly false is the inner being of these democracies is shown most clearly by the relations which, according to their needs, they enjoy with the rest of the world. We can expect to see the democracies naturally glorifying actual regimes of force in small countries if it fitted the concept of these democracies. Indeed, they would declare themselves ready, if necessary, to fight for them, while on the other hand the greatest demonstrations of confidence in such states which are not satisfactory to the democracies simply are ignored, misinterpreted, or summarily distorted into exactly the opposite of what they are. And not only that. These democracies, if it is politically expedient, even glorify the Bolshevik form of state, although the latter designates itself as a dictatorship of the proletariat. In other words, the real democracies manage to designate countries as dictatorships whose governments can point to a ninety-nine per cent vote of assent by the people in its administration. The real democracies

also manage to admire, as highly honorable democratic institutions, other countries whose governments declare themselves to be dictatorships, and can only exist through massacres, executions, tortures and the like. Is it not in reality a grim mockery of world history that in the midst of honestly chartered democracies in Geneva, that bloody representative of the cruellest tyranny of all times may move as an honorable member? Thus, we too in Germany have experienced this close tie between Jewish capitalism and theoretical Communistic anti-capitalism. . . . Moscow Bolshevism is the honored ally of capitalistic democracy. (Nuremberg, Sept. 12, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 13, 1938)

Arch-Democrat Par Excellence

If these British officials now explain to the democratic world that in the present year we have destroyed two democracies, then I can only ask: What essentially is democracy anyway? Who has the right to speak in the name of democracy? Did God hand the key to democracy to Messrs. Churchill and Duff Cooper? Is this inscribed on tables of law which are in the possession of the British opposition? In our eyes democracy is a regime which is supported by the will of the people. According to the rules of parliamentary democracy I at one time became Chancellor in Germany—and indeed leader of by far the strongest party. According to the rules of parliamentary democracy I received formerly the unconditional majority and—Mr. Churchill may doubt it if he likes—today the unanimous approval of the German people. . . .

I, as an arch-democrat, have removed two dictatorships, namely, the dictatorships of Mr. Schuschnigg and the dictatorship of Mr. Benes. I tried peacefully to influence these two dictatorships to establish finally in a democratic way the right of self-determination for those concerned. I failed in this attempt. Not till then did I apply the power of the great German people in order to establish democracy in these countries—that is, in order to give oppressed peoples their freedom. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 10, 1938)

4

France, Mortal Enemy

Gather together all enemies against France—this will be our watchword.

Munich, May 21, 1928

When a Frenchman shakes the hand of a German statesman in friendship, that hand is deadly for Germany.

Munich, March 6, 1929

Hatred of France was one of the important principles of National Socialism in the years before Hitler came to power. The Fuehrer's attitude toward France as the "mortal" enemy of the German people has been based upon a number of fundamental propositions: that France wanted to dominate Europe by making Germany a hodge-podge of little states; that France was the traditional foe and, as such, had to be annihilated; that it was necessary for Germany to make alliances with France's potential rivals (Italy and England); finally, that only after the complete destruction of France could Germany expand toward the East.

The Fuehrer's enmity toward France is deeply rooted in his mind and emotions. It has injured his sense of national pride and honor to have Germany obeisant to a neighbor he has considered inferior and decadent. To him the Versailles Treaty was primarily an instrument of French infamy.

Hatred of France was quite deeply ingrained in the whole of the early National Socialist movement. Even a casual perusal of the Nazi press in the twenties discloses a plethora of propagandist devices designed to stir up anti-French feeling and to demonstrate the necessity of stripping France of her power as a great nation.

The material in this chapter presents Hitler's real attitude toward the French. It is the attitude of a man filled with hate and revenge and incapable of compromise. This was the reason why he was so embittered and infuriated by events at Locarno and by Stresemann's policy of conciliation with France.

To appreciate the extent of Hitler's opportunism, the reader should compare his violent denunciations in the following pages with his soft-spoken, pleading words concerning France in Chapter 11. His changed attitude after his assumption of the Chancellorship was merely one aspect of his post-1933 policy. Essentially his sudden good will toward France arose from political expediency and the needs of his new position. It was, of course, part of his broad strategy of neutralizing potential opponents and isolating them by the evanescent subtleties of carefully manufactured propaganda.

The Machiavellian French

France intends today as always to dissolve Germany as a political unit and to destroy her. In any case, the lack of balance between France's external power and internal strength is today greater than ever. France owes her present position of power solely to the momentary weakness of Germany. France has no intention of evacuating the Ruhr region or of giving back the Saar region or the Rhineland. The reasons for her occupation policy are political, not economic. Of course, efforts are being made to prove to us that France has to keep the Ruhr region occupied because of economic considerations; the biased German press does its utmost to hammer this into our heads day after day. The French Government cannot back down, if for no other reason than that behind this government there stands a people which demands that its national welfare be looked after with unscrupulous energy. (Munich, Feb. 26, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 28, 1923)

Strife or Subjugation

What France plans is clear and simple. She is only waiting until the weather gets warm so that she can throw an army of 800 to 900,000 blacks into the country and then accomplish the complete subjugation and rape of Germany. The persistent aim of France is the annihilation of the last possibilities of a reawakening of national pride in Germany. The question for us is: What are we to do now? Passive resistance in the long run is impossible. Guerilla warfare has meaning only when there is an army in the first line of battle. The question of help from the outside is a foolish hope. England, in view of our lack of energy, will not feel compelled to do anything for us, even though it is not at all to her advantage to have France gain hegemony over Europe. The same holds true of Italy. Where in Germany is there even one element in a leading position which could successfully incite the masses to action, which could induce them to fight unto death itself for this Republic?

There is only one hope in these desperate times for all Germans who have not become completely blind and stupid and that is the National Socialist Workers Party. We are not warmongering; we only sound a warning. (Neuhausen, March 20, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 22, 1923)

The Inevitability of Enmity

In the relations between Germany and France there exist in the final analysis differences which cannot be done away with by the dispatches of a Kurt Eisner* or by cowardly submission. The French attitude toward the Reich is today the same as it was 400, 300, 200, 100, 50 years ago. Living side by side with the French is possible only if we are constantly ready for action and if our pistols are loaded. He who cannot do this will find himself on the ground. It is impossible to bridge the differences in this case. Only one thing is sure: If Germany is strong, she will be free; if she is weak, she will be oppressed. (Munich, April 13, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 15/16, 1923)

The Threat of Dissolution

What was meant by the policy of fulfillment in those days? It was a very simple formula. It was the idea of satisfying the enemy's demands as far as possible in order to facilitate the resurrection of Germany. The question of the legality of the demands played no role at all. No state could have done more than Germany. But the German people is supposed to fulfill demands that are greater than its entire national wealth. These demands therefore must have a very specific purpose—one that has nothing to do with economic considerations. France does not want reparations; she wants Germany's destruction. This means the realization of an age-old dream, namely, the hegemony of France over Europe.

The term "reparations" is nothing more than a "legal instrument" so devised that under a pretense of justice it is possible to destroy a state, to bring about the internal dissolution of a people, and to replace that state with a conglomeration of small states which will in turn devour each other. The government therefore could satisfy France only by liquidating the German Reich and by dissolving the state. Satisfying France is not a question of economics; it is a question of politics. This was the problem which caused Dr. Wirth's collapse.* That which would satisfy France—the dissolution of the state—the government cannot achieve and that which they can achieve does not satisfy France.

*Kurt Eisner was an Independent Socialist who headed a Revolutionary Government in Bavaria after the fall of the Wittelsbach dynasty in Nov. 1918. Eisner was assassinated on Feb. 21, 1919.

*Joseph Wirth, German Chancellor, May 1921 to Nov. 1922.

This consideration alone points the way in which Germany can be rebuilt. Only after the question of arming the nation, a question which is not primarily of a technical nature but of a spiritual nature, that is, a question of the will, only after this is solved is a regeneration of Germany possible. And this must be solved in the sense that the German people again understands that one can pursue politics only by means of power and again power. As long as our people and our government do not understand that, any talk about rebuilding Germany is nonsense. . . .

What would France be today if there were no internationalists in Germany, but only nationalists? If we had nothing else then but our fists! If 60,000,000 people had only the one will of being fanatically national—then weapons would grow right out of their own hands. France then would never dare to treat Germany as she does now. France dares to do so only because she knows that her allies are sitting right here in our midst. (Munich, May 4, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 6/7, 1923)

The Balkanization of Germany

Two Powers play a decisive role in the future development of Europe: England and France. England has the one and everlasting aim of Balkanizing Europe and of establishing a balance of power in Europe so that her position in the world will not be threatened. She is not, in principle, an enemy of Germany, but she is rather the power that tries to gain the first place in Europe. France is the outright enemy of Germany. Just as England needs the Balkanization of Europe, France needs the Balkanization of Germany in order to dominate Europe. After four and one-half years of hard struggle, victory, thanks to the Revolution, fell to the coalition of these two Powers. The result was as follows. France was confronted with this question: Was she to bring her eternal war aim to full realization or not, that is, could she destroy Germany, and rob her of all the means of subsistence? Today France is nearing the fulfillment of this age-old plan. It makes no difference which government is in power in France. The supreme goal will remain—the destruction of Germany, the annihilation of 20,000,000 Germans and the dissolution of Germany into small states. (Munich, March 27, 1924; *Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 28, 1924)

Eternal Foe

We are today encircled in Europe by a power [France] which through the instinct of self-preservation has made an alliance with two other states. France, Poland, and Czechoslovakia are trying to sabotage every attempt at German regeneration. France needs the Rhine and wants to dissolve Germany. France will always be our enemy. Bismarck evaluated the possibility of a reconciliation with France when, on September 23, 1891, interrupting General Wimpffen, he said very soberly: Do not talk about reconciliation. During the last 200 years France declared war on us twenty-nine times, regardless of the type of government which ruled in France. France will always declare war on Germany as soon as she feels strong enough. (Munich, April 11, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 15/16, 1927)

The Annihilation of France

If we examine the political aim of France we get the same picture [as that presented by England]. By tradition France is imperialistic. French mentality seems to be concerned more with fame in the field of foreign affairs. The aim of France is to guard the most threatened border from Germany. This accounts for the attempt to get the Rhine and for the creation of small stateism in Germany. . . . It makes no difference who has ruled in France, the goal has always been the same—to destroy Germany and to play one German tribe against the other. It is absurd to believe that this policy has ever been abandoned. An aim which has been sealed with the blood of a million men cannot be changed. In France itself the Treaty of Versailles has no critics. No matter whether they represent the Right or the Left—no one thinks of criticizing Versailles. For the French, the Treaty of Versailles is the granite foundation of order in the world. . . .

There is only one possibility for Germany to escape her encirclement, and that is to destroy the state which by the very nature of things will always be our deadly enemy. And that is France. When a people sees its whole existence threatened by an enemy, then it must put everything else aside and it must strive to annihilate this one enemy. (Munich, May 16, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 18, 1927)

Stresemann's Policy

In view of the fact that we are dealing with foreign policy, we must prove why the course taken by Gustav Stresemann* is wrong, why it must remain wrong, why it will remain wrong even in the remote future, and why this policy cannot achieve anything better for us than the congratulations of the French, who have every reason to express gratitude to Gustav Stresemann. We are convinced that no good can come of this policy, because it is contrary to all good sense and to all sound instinct, because it is absurd in the light of all German history, and because the present itself has shown and disclosed that this type of foreign policy is completely unfruitful and extremely harmful. . . .

France will always try to destroy Germany, to split her into many small states, to acquire the Rhine frontier, and to make sure of the Rhine once and for all. This is necessary because France is incapable of any political action on a large scale so long as a powerful Germany adjoins her northeastern flank. Every Frenchman will see in Germany not the state of Stresemann but the state with a history going back 2,000 years. Every Frenchman, whether Royalist or Jacobin, will try in the final analysis to safeguard France at Germany's expense, and if possible by means of dividing Germany into small states. The French have always thought they had the right to meddle in German affairs, and to act as the protector of certain of the small states and of some of the individual German princes. This was in order to prevent German consolidation.

The moment the German Republic no longer follows a completely Francophile policy of self-enervation, that moment France becomes our mortal enemy, the mortal enemy which she has always been to Germany. If France has any friendly feelings toward Germany, then it is not for Germany as such, but for the particular form of government which momentarily seems beneficial to France. France certainly never has friendly feelings toward our people but only toward the conditions which harm our people. Anyone who studies German history will discover how often France showed her attitude in this respect, how for centuries it was French policy to do nothing but to divide Germany in order to be able to dominate her, and how at all times every outstanding German realized this. Only a few years ago Gustav Stresemann himself knew this and declared that France will

*Gustav Stresemann, German Chancellor, Aug.-Nov., 1923; Foreign Minister, 1923-1929.

always be our enemy and will always remain our enemy. He declared that power and not right will be the determining factor, as was proved beyond all doubt by the World War. . . .

It is nonsense to believe that France carried on this gigantic struggle for Alsace-Lorraine alone. Politically Alsace-Lorraine was a clever motif, the motif which the mass of the [French] people needed. The aim of the government was much more embracing. The aim was to break up Germany, and that is why France sacrificed millions. The fact was forgotten that fifty years earlier [1871] France lost Alsace because she wanted more than she already had. If it had not been for German victories, the Rhine would have been lost already in those days. For France's war aim was the left bank of the Rhine which was a symbol of the prevention of German unification. France did not accomplish this aim.

The question is often asked, whether the blood of the German heroes shed then [1914-1918] did any good. Many people said that it was shed in vain. But that is not true, for, thanks to the sacrifices of those 2,000,000 and the heroic fight of the other 6,000,000, the war was kept from German territory. If the war had been fought on German territory, then, because of the location of our industrial centers, we would not only have had to lose the war, but the entire structure of the Reich would have gone to pieces. We owe it to those 2,000,000 dead that Germany was preserved as a state. We do not owe that to the German Republic—to the so-called statesmen of to-day. If the spirit of sacrifice had been as weak as the intelligence of the new German Government, then we would have perished. France was restrained by the impressions made by our heroic front, by the recollection of this gigantic army which showed France for four and a half years what fighting means. It was this that prevented France from achieving her goals. The question which concerned the French was: How can we, by lies, deceit, and hypocrisy, get the German army out of our country? This was the consideration which prompted France to renounce her ultimate aims. That is why she complied with English requests, and that is the reason she listened to general talk about world disarmament. . . . All measures on the part of France are consistently aimed at destroying Germany. France tries to achieve her old political goal by means of unnatural burdens, continuous annexations, and privations imposed upon the [German] people. . . . France is everywhere the agitator, the moving spirit, never satisfied with what she gets, unceasingly working toward the slow but sure dissolution of Germany. . . .

He [Stresemann] led the German people on the path to Locarno. This was a most monstrous deed, because for the first time in world history, we as a people accepted treaties without being forced to do so, which meant our death. Only a very slight suggestion on the part of the clever English induced Stresemann to write personally to Briand and to make the proposition that Germany definitely give up claim to Alsace-Lorraine, to the nationality of the Rhine and the Rhineland, and to German sovereignty in regard to the granting of the right of transit (*Durchmarschrecht*). Stresemann therewith gave up the last bit of national sovereignty so we could at last join the League of Nations. This was the same Stresemann who before the war and during the war fought to the utmost against such ideas, who never believed that international understanding would be at all possible, or that Germany's fate would be decided under the direction of neutral powers. And today our enemies are deciding Germany's fate. In the seventh year after the war and on the day of the great battle of Leipzig, a pact is signed by which Germany voluntarily recognizes the Treaty of Versailles. By what right then can we still direct opposition against that treaty? In the seventh year after the war, a German statesman renounces claim to Alsace-Lorraine, and the German people tolerates him and reelects him. If there were but a spark of honor left, and any respect for the sacrifice of the 2,000,000 dead, this could not have been done. We owe it to the dead not to give up our claim.

A German statesman lends a hand in making the Rhine neutral territory. How happy and proud all of us were when on one of our excursions we saw the Rhine for the first time! We give up our sovereignty over this territory, while the enemy does not even think of doing such a thing unless he is forced to. That is incredible! . . . When a people which cannot exist from its own territory, gives its fate into the hands of those who have the greatest interest in oppressing it, then that is madness. This is what Stresemann did. (Munich, April 17, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 19, 1928)

Alliance With the Devil

I was an opponent of France my entire life because I see in France the deadly enemy of my people. . . . May the people come to recognize that which is necessary, namely, not to come to terms with France but to organize general European opposition to France. If today Satan would come along and offer to be my ally against France, I would

give him my hand, and I would march with him. For I know one thing: As long as France is not displaced from her position of hegemony in Europe, Germany will never acquire that which is necessary for her existence. I see two states which can never have an interest in this hegemony of France. They are Germany and Italy, and perhaps also England, which cannot wish to see France become an all-powerful state. (Munich, May 23, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 25, 1928)

Always Against France

There can be only one pole-star for German foreign policy: How can we again acquire power? For this purpose France has to be completely eliminated. France is not only the enemy of a German Government, she is not only the enemy of the form of the German State or of a certain mentality, the French people is the hereditary enemy of the German people. And if a Communist today says: Class against class—my dear friend, if the world becomes too small, no longer will class be against class, but people against people and the primeval struggle will again come to life in all its violence. Then your ridiculous class concepts will break apart as though they were nothing and all that will be left will be people against people. Thus the motto for every possible German foreign policy is: Always against France. Never will a German government succeed in coming to an understanding with France. . . . If one has grasped the magnitude of the task of German foreign policy, it must be clear that it will never be solved with the phrase about the restitution of any German boundary. Boundary problems are not what are at stake but the existence of the German nation in its entirety. . . .

The goal of foreign policy is the weakening of the hegemony of France over Europe and the attempt to effect this by political means. . . . Are there states in Europe which do not need to be friendly towards Germany but which must have an interest in seeing that France does not attain a position of exclusive hegemony? There is a state which, to the extent that it grows nationalistic, must become the opponent of France, that is, if an insane German foreign policy does not drive it back into the arms of France from time to time. That state is Italy. Even Bismarck realized that Italy is the state which has the least grounds for friction with Germany in the future, that the interests of no people run parallel with those of Germany to such an extent as those of Italy. . . .

If German foreign policy does not attempt to bring about a weakening of French hegemony . . . it will never succeed in breaking Germany's chains. . . . Then our people will have the ignominious lot of a second Switzerland or a second Holland, it will decline to the position of a beggar folk of head-waiters and hotel men, of praising its own works of art, of becoming a buffoon at the fair and being glad if strangers come and throw him a groschen as a tip. . . . With this future in mind we can ask the question: What has Mr. Stresemann actually accomplished? In what respect did he negotiate for the vital interests of the German nation?

He negotiated without an aim and without a plan. He went to Paris, to that place where he never should have gone. He thought that he could conciliate the eternal and sworn enemy of the German people through his Masonic agreement with the statesman [Briand] in the French capital. When his train arrived in Paris, a small group of onlookers applauded him. These were the paid claqueurs. The greater part of the onlookers hissed. That was the French people. Stresemann went to France and tried to convert the mortal enemy. But why should France change her policy? Briand explained it thus: Just because you are no longer armed, that is not the reason for our enmity. We hate you because you exist. The only way Stresemann could have gained the friendship of France would have been to sign an agreement to the effect that the German people will not have any more children, that it will renounce all cultural expression, that it will nail all of its intellectual capacity on the cross, and that Germany will commit suicide. Not until then will France be Germany's "friend." (Munich, Sept. 22, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 23/24, 1928)

Hate Thy Neighbor

France will never permit the burden which rests upon us to be lightened. She hopes that Germany will collapse under this burden in order that she can then dominate Europe. And since German foreign policy is a problem of the preservation of Germany as such, and not of single fragmentary parts, we seek allies who must at some time come to blows with France. Thus we turn our attention to Italy. The natural ally of Germany must be the natural enemy of France. We consciously work for a European bloc and for that purpose we seek as an ally only that power which is itself young and strong and which has a superabundance of vitality. That power again is Italy.

In the future, history will also measure the destiny of nations on the battlefield. What France hates, I love; what France loves, I hate. And if our German politicians do not know what is to our advantage, the French know only too well what is injurious to us. (Munich, Feb. 21, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 22, 1929)

Friendship Impossible

France can never be Germany's friend. She desires the complete Balkanization of Germany. She leaves no stone unturned to achieve her eternal goal of keeping Germany divided. France will operate with tactical cleverness but she will never lose sight of this goal. . . . In my estimation there is only one state in Europe [Italy] that, on the basis of its natural interests—a fact which even Prince Bismarck prophesied—is an opponent of France and will be more and more so. Herr Justizrat Warmuth thinks that Mussolini is an egoist. I can assure him that as long as an absolute, egoistical national policy was not pursued in Italy, a real alliance was not conceivable. Only in the most intense Italian nationalism is there the possibility of antagonism against France. I do not expect that Italy would enter into negotiations with Germany out of reasons of sympathy. Those are the hopes of the Social Democrats when they are in power, that is, that France would cooperate with us out of reasons of sympathy.

I reject Nibelungen-like loyalty; that was the requisite of the old German Empire. I am convinced that if a state today arranges its foreign policy on the bases of sympathy, it must of necessity experience ship-wreck. That is what destroyed the old Germany. What motivates us exclusively today when we calmly consider the eventualities of foreign policy is the question: Is it conceivable that a state exists in Europe which, in the pursuit of its natural interests, can come into conflict with France? That state is Italy. If Italy follows her national interests, then some day she must come into conflict with France. The only thing that motivates me is national fanaticism and national egoism which is just as great. I believe that this possibility of an alliance with Italy not only appears to be indicated for the moment, but, in consequence of the completely divergent spheres of interest of Italy and France, it is the only possibility of an alliance of a permanent nature.

The National Socialist Movement has always represented this view, and not only since the march of Mussolini on Rome. I have emphasized the fact since 1920 that Italy will be the future enemy of

France. The more Italy serves her own interests, the sooner will she become the opponent of France. I, therefore, personally rejoiced when a government came to power in Italy which confronted weak factions and Marxist methods, which were under the influence of Free Mason and Jewish tendencies, with a clear national regime. At that moment the natural antagonism between Italy and France became more pronounced. At that moment I became really convinced for the first time that our foreign policy was correct. . . . Our foreign policy is not just a game with us; it is a serious consideration which is carefully thought-out. I see no other way for Germany but the one which seems to us to be the right one, namely, to break the Entente [of the Allied Powers] and then to make an alliance with that power which itself has an interest in isolating France. (Munich, May 8, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 9/10, 1929)

5

Perish the Jew

The greatest task of our people remains that of being the leader in the coming fight of the Aryan against the Jewish world peril.

Munich, April 21, 1922

International Jewry is the ferment of the decomposition of peoples and states.

Berlin, Jan. 30, 1943

Hitler's hysterical anti-Semitic outbursts, which occupy a special place in the catalogue of his obsessions, cannot be explained as merely opportunistic. They are the result of a deep private hatred. One need not be a psychiatrist to recognize in his vehement Jew-baiting a thinly disguised feeling of inferiority and a childish resentment against the achievements of an "alien" and "despised" race.

Neither Hitler nor the Nazis created anti-Semitism in Germany. It has long been a disgraceful aspect of German history. In recent years, however, German anti-Semitism has reached new heights. Hitler had to blame some group for the woes of the Fatherland and the Jews were a well-nigh perfect scapegoat. Upon what other segment of the population could so many of the nation's ills be so neatly fastened?

With typical disregard for consistency, Hitler has made the Jews responsible for practically everything he has chosen to attack. The Jew is a Communist—and also a capitalist. On the one hand, he is the scheming wheedler of the proletariat—and, on the other, he is an overstuffed plutocrat. The Jew is a cowardly pacifist—and also a vicious warmonger. With contempt for the intelligence of his audiences, Hitler has ignored the valuable contributions of Jews to German life and culture.

By tying up anti-Semitism with all of the nation's miseries, Hitler has directed the frustrated rage of the German people against a convenient and defenseless victim.

In Behalf of Christ

Did the Jew have an interest in the collapse [of 1918]? Today we can discuss that objectively. You probably know that comparatively speaking very few Jews have suffered. Let no one say to me:
★ The poor Eastern Jew! Naturally they did not have anything to begin with, for the simple reason that they came from a country which they had pillaged and eaten to the bone for centuries, and have never been and never will be productively active.

It is quite logical that these gentlemen arrived poor to begin with. But just look at such an Oriental after he has been here for five or six years. Compare the million workers in Berlin in 1914 with what they are today. . . . How have they changed? They have gotten thinner; their clothes are ragged and worn; they have become poor. And now go look for the 100,000 Eastern Jews who immigrated during the first years of the war. You will not find them today. Most of them have made good and already own automobiles. This has come about not because the Jews are more clever—for I defy you to say that the million decent and honest working people are nothing but blockheads. The sole reason is that these 100,000 Jews were never ready to work along honorably in a national organism for the common good. From the very beginning, they regarded this entire national organism as nothing more than a hot-house for them to thrive in.

② The Jew has not become poorer. He is slowly bloating up, and if you do not believe this, I beg you to go and look in our health resorts. There you will find two kinds of people: The German, who goes there to catch a breath of fresh air for the first time in a long while and to get rested; and the Jew, who goes there to get rid of his fat. If you go out into our mountains, whom do you find in new yellow boots, with beautiful knapsacks, the contents of which generally do not amount to much anyway? And why should they? The Jews go up to the hotel, generally as far as the train goes, and where the train stops there they also stop. They sit around within a kilometer's distance of the hotel, like blowflies around a cadaver.

These are certainly not our "working" classes—neither our intellectual nor our physical workers. You generally find the "working" classes in worn clothing, climbing about somewhere off to the side, for the simple reason that they feel ashamed even to enter this perfumed atmosphere with their old-fashioned clothes dating from 1913 and 1914. The Oberammergau Passion Plays this summer will show you just who has the time, the leisure, and the money to enjoy

nature and the spectacle of Christ's sufferings. No, the Jew certainly did not suffer privations. . . .

The same Jew, who as a majority Socialist or as an Independent led you in those days [November 1918], still leads you. No matter whether he is an Independent or a Communist, he has remained the same. And just as he did not look after your interests at that time but after the interests of the capital of his own race, so today he certainly will not lead you in the fight against his race and its capital. On the contrary, he will prevent you from fighting your real exploiters. He will never help to liberate you, for he is not the one who is enslaved. (V)

While now in Soviet Russia millions are starving and dying, while in Soviet Russia 30,000,000 so-called "Proletarians" lie prostrate, clawing roots and grass from the soil in order to prolong their lives for even a few days or weeks, Chicherin and a delegation of about 200 Soviet Jews are traveling through Europe on special trains, going to night clubs, attending strip-teases, and living in the best of hotels. As a matter of fact they are better off than the millions of so-called "Bourgeois" you once thought you had to fight. The 400 Soviet commissars of Jewish nationality are not suffering want, nor the thousands upon thousands of deputy commissars. On the contrary. All the treasures which the "Proletarian" in his madness took from the so-called "Bourgeoisie" in order to fight so-called capitalism, have all now gotten into the hands of the Soviet commissars. It is true that a few workers in those days took the pocketbook of his landlord or his employer; it is true that he took rings and diamonds and rejoiced at being in possession of the treasures formerly owned only by the "Bourgeoisie." But in his hands those possessions are dead, yes, really dead gold. They do not do him any good. He is stuck in his wilderness and he cannot feed himself on diamonds. He gives millions in value for a crust of bread. But the bread is in the hands of the State Central Organization and that is in the hands of the Jews. In that way everything, absolutely everything, that the common man once thought he was winning for himself, flows right back into the hands of his seducers.

The Jew accomplished it. A redistribution of wealth took place, but not according to the desire of the masses. It was nothing more than a shifting of wealth. Millions of men were deprived of their last ruble, which they had once saved honestly, honorably, and carefully. These rubles, by the millions, now became the property of those who as leaders had not done anything and who are not doing anything

today except to starve and bleed the people. And now, my dear *Volksgenossen*, do you believe that those people who are doing the same thing here will end the Revolution [of 1918]? They do not wish to end the Revolution for there is no necessity for them to do so. The Revolution is for them nothing but milk and honey and furthermore they cannot end the Revolution. . . .

The Aryan regards work as the basis for the maintenance of the national community as such; the Jew regards work as a means of exploiting other peoples. The Jew never works as a productive creator without the great prospect of becoming the master. He works unproductively, using and profiting from the work of others. We therefore understand the iron words once pronounced by Mommser. The Jew is the ferment of the decomposition of peoples. This means that the Jew destroys and has to destroy, because he is completely lacking in any concept of work for the common good. It does not matter whether the individual Jew is "decent" or not. He has certain traits which nature has given him and he can never rid himself of these traits. The Jew is harmful to us. Whether he harms us consciously or unconsciously is not the question. We must consciously protect the welfare of our people. . . .

We were finally the ones who pointed out to the people on a large scale the peril which crept into our midst, a peril which millions of people did not realize, but which will nevertheless lead us all to ruin—the Jewish peril. Today people again say that we are "agitators." In this respect I should like to make reference to someone greater than myself. Count Lerchenfeld declared in the last session of the *Landtag*, that his feeling "as man and as Christian" keeps him from being an anti-Semite. I say: My feeling as a Christian points me to my Lord and Savior as a fighter. It points me to the man who, once lonely and with only a few followers, recognized these Jews for what they were, and called men to fight them, and who, so help me, was greatest not as a sufferer but as a fighter. With boundless love, as a Christian and as a man, I read the passage which relates how the Lord finally gathered His strength and made use of the whip in order to drive the usurers, the vipers, and cheats from the temple. Today, 2,000 years later, I recognize with deep emotion Christ's tremendous fight for this world against the Jewish poison. I recognize it most profoundly by the fact that He had to shed His blood on the cross for this fight. As a Christian it is not my duty to permit myself to be cheated but it is my duty to be a champion of truth and of right.

As man it is my duty to see to it that humanity will not suffer the

same catastrophic collapse as did an old civilization about 2,000 years ago, a civilization which was also driven to destruction by the Jewish people. In those days, however, when Rome fell, new and endless masses of Germanic peoples poured in from the North to take its place. But if Germany were to fall today, who will follow after us? The Germanic blood on this earth is slowly being exhausted unless we gather up all our strength and free ourselves. . . .

As a Christian I owe something to my own people. I see how this people is working and working, laboring and exerting itself, and still at the end of the week it has nothing but misery and poverty to show for it. One perhaps does not realize it in the homes of the nobility. But when I go out in the mornings and see those people in the bread-lines and look into their drawn faces, then I become convinced that I am a veritable devil and not a Christian if I do not feel compassion and do not wage war, as our Lord did 2,000 years ago, against those who are pillaging and exploiting this poor people.

To be sure, the people is aroused today by this misery. Outwardly it may appear apathetic, but inwardly it is fermenting. Many a person may say that it is an accursed crime to arouse passion under such circumstances. And I tell myself: Passion will be aroused by increasing misery and this passion will manifest itself in one way or another. I therefore ask this question of those who today are calling us "agitators": What do you have to offer the people in the way of a belief to which they may cling? Nothing at all. For you yourself do not believe in your own prescriptions. That is the mightiest mission of our Movement, namely, to give the searching and bewildered masses a new, firm belief, a belief which will not abandon them in these days of chaos, which they will swear and abide by, so that at least somewhere they will again find a place where their hearts can be at rest. We are going to accomplish this! It is proved by the thousands who keep coming to us and who perhaps for the first time in years find something worth living for again. . . .

Two thousand years ago a man was likewise denounced by this particular race which today is denouncing and blaspheming everywhere; by the race which is agitating everywhere and which regards every opposition to it as an accursed crime. That man was dragged into court and they said then: He is arousing the people! So he also was "agitating!" And against whom? Against "God," they cried. Yes indeed, he was agitating against the "god" of the Jews, for that "god" is money. (Munich, April 12, 1922; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 22, 1922)

Destroyer of Civilization

The Jew became the founder of the Social Democratic Movement, at that time. He succeeded with exceptional cleverness in securing the leadership more and more by means of two measures. He applied one measure on the Right, the other measure on the Left, for he had his apostles in both camps. As regards the Right, he tried to exaggerate all existing shortcomings to such an extent that through the emphasis on those things which necessarily antagonize the common man, the poor devil, the latter would be aroused as much as possible. It was the Jew who caused the greed for money to increase to an extreme. It was he who finally preached that unscrupulousness in the attainment of business ends was a matter of course. It was he who forced others to use the same methods because of his competition. It was he who became so heartless in the attainment of his ends that the saying, "Business, too, marches over corpses," became generally accepted. It was the Jew in particular whose repulsive insolence aroused the deadly hatred of the great masses. While the Jew on the one hand corrupted people by his bad example, he polluted their blood by systematic bastardization. More and more Jews filtered into the upper families, and it was from the Jews that the latter took their wives. The result was that in a short time it was precisely the leading class of the nation that had become completely estranged from its own people.

This was the prerequisite for the Jew's work on the Left. He made good use of this prerequisite. On the Left he was the common demagogue. Two measures were sufficient for him to drive the national intelligentsia from the leadership of the working class. First, there was the international approach. The Jew knew only too well that the moment he convinced the working class of the necessity of the international approach in his life and struggle, the national intelligentsia would drop out of the working class movement. For it would not continue under such circumstances. The national intelligentsia is willing to make the greatest sacrifices, to do everything for its people, but it cannot be so insane as to believe that a people can be made happy and prosperous by renouncing the existence of that people, by renouncing its own rights, and by abolishing national resistance toward foreign elements. The national intelligentsia could not do that and so it stayed away. Then there was the Jew's second measure—Marxist theory. The moment the statement is made that private property as such is theft, that is, in other words, as soon as one forsakes the self-evident

formula that only natural resources can and should be common property, but that everything that anyone earns honestly should be his, from that moment too the economic intelligentsia with national ideals could no longer cooperate, for it realized that this theory would lead to the collapse of all human culture. Thus the Jew succeeded in isolating this new movement [of the workers] from all national elements. Furthermore, the Jew succeeded, by an ingenious exploitation of the press, in influencing the masses to such an extent that the faults of the Left appeared to the Right as the faults of the German worker, and the faults of the Right at the same time appeared to the German worker as the faults of the German middle class. Neither of the two groups realized that the faults of both sides were the result of a scheme, planned by devilish foreign agitators. This alone explains how the greatest farce in history was possible, namely, how the Jews of the stock exchange could become the leaders of the German Workers Movement. It is a gigantic fraud, the like of which is seldom seen in world history. . . .

In all this one can see again and again how well they work together, the Jew from the stock exchange and the leader of the workers; the newspaper of the stock exchange and the organ of the workers. . . . While the business agent Moses Cohn persuades his company to react most unfavorably to the demands of the workers, his brother Isaac Cohn, the labor leader, stands in the factory yard, arouses the masses and shouts: Just look at them, they only want to oppress you; throw off your chains. And upstairs his brother sees to it that those chains are well forged. On the one hand is the organ of the stock exchange, intent on encouraging ever-greater speculation. The prices of grain and all foods are driven higher and higher at an unprecedented rate. On the other hand there is the organ of the workers which arouses the masses by telling them: Bread has gone up; one thing and another has increased in price; do not tolerate it any longer; awake, proletarian. . . .

How long can this process go on? For it implies the annihilation of the economic system as well as the annihilation of a whole people. It is quite evident that this fourth estate [the workers] was not organized by the Jew just to safeguard the interests of that class. It is clear that the Jew Isaac Cohn does not stand in the factory out of love for the workers. It is self-evident that all those apostles who are talking themselves blue in the face on behalf of the workers, but at the same time patronize the Hotel Excelsior, ride in express trains, and spend their vacations in Nice, are not exerting themselves for the

sake of the people. No, the people is not to derive any benefits from all this. The people is supposed to destroy the backbone of its own independence, its own economic system so it will all the more certainly sink into the golden fetters of the everlasting interest-slavery of the Jewish race. . . .

How long can this continue? It will continue until suddenly from out of the masses someone comes forth who will seize the leadership, find more comrades, and gradually cause the anger that has long been restrained to break loose against the deceivers. This is the great lurking danger which confronts the Jew; and he has only one safeguard against it, namely, to do away with this evil national intelligentsia. This is the irrevocable and ultimate aim of the Jewish revolution. And he must pursue this aim. He knows full well that his system is no blessing, that he is no master race (*Herrenvolk*), that he is an exploiter, that the Jews are a people of robbers. The Jew has never yet founded a civilization, but he has destroyed hundreds. He can show nothing of his own creation. Everything that he has is stolen. He has foreign people, foreign workers build his temples; foreigners create and work for him; foreigners shed their blood for him. He knows no "people's army" (*Volksheer*) but only paid mercenaries, who are ready to risk their lives for him. He has no art of his own, everything has either been stolen from other peoples or imitated. He does not even know how to preserve these costly possessions. In his hands they turn immediately to filth and dung. He also knows that he cannot maintain any state for any length of time. There is a difference between him and the Aryan. It is true that the Aryan has also dominated inferior peoples. But how? He went about his task, cleared the forests, transformed the wilderness into civilizations, and he did not use the inferior peoples for his own purposes but he integrated them into the state in accordance with their abilities. It was through the Aryan that art and science flourished. It was he alone who, in the final analysis, knew how to establish states.

The Jew is incapable of all this. His revolutions, therefore, must be "international." They must spread like a disease. For the Jew is incapable of building a state and saying: Look, here it is, a model for all. Imitate us! He has to see to it that the epidemic does not abate, that it is not confined to any one place, because it might otherwise consume itself there. Thus he has to spread everything internationally. And how long? Until the whole world falls in ruins and brings him down with it in the midst of the ruins. (Munich, July 28, 1922; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Aug. 16, 1922)

Internationalism Is Judaism

Internationalization nowadays means nothing but Judaization. We have gone so far that today a people of 60,000,000 sees its destiny in the will of a few dozen Jewish bankers. This was made possible only by the fact that prior to the present time we had already been Judaized from the cultural point of view. The undermining of the Germanic concept of individuality by means of catchwords started a long time ago. Democracy, majority, world-conscience, world-solidarity, world-peace, the international character of art, and the like, disintegrated our racial consciousness, fostered cowardice, and today we have to admit that the humble Turk is more of a man than we. That was the work of the press controlled by the international stockmarket.

There can be no salvation until the cause of this dissension, the Jew, has been made harmless. Nor can there be any deliverance until political dishonesty and cowardice have been destroyed. We have therefore declared war against all these powers that are hostile to us. . . . Extremes must be fought with extremes. We must oppose the materialistic infection of the Jewish pest with a flaming ideal. And if the rest of the world speaks of humanity, then we say: The Fatherland above everything. (Munich, Sept. 18, 1922; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 20, 1922)

The Middle Class Versus the Jew

A Judaization of economic life is undeniably taking place here in Germany, just as it is in Russia. The only opponent of this process is the middle class, which stands for individualism and which therefore is politically opposed to a form of government which permits such Judaization. Thus this middle class is the truly national class, for those on the Right are spoiled; those on the Left have been prejudiced. The important task of the middle class is to bridge the gulf between the classes, a gulf which is bound to send a people to perdition. The middle class is the connecting link between rich and poor. Its basic trait is its comparative racial purity. In view of the fact that the middle class is the main enemy of the Judaization of the economic and political life of our state, it must be systematically annihilated. In order to achieve this, the Jew inoculates the middle class of modern democracy, which is praised to the skies in speeches and writing, but which points to only one equation: Democracy equals capitalism equals the Jew. For who rules in the so-called democracies, in France,

England, and America, in the bourgeois democracies? The Jew! By what means does he rule? In Russia he rules through terrorization, in the rest of the world through propaganda and through the contamination of national literature. Another method is the racial contamination of the peoples, for no state has ever gone to ruin except through the decline of its race. Among animals we observe the laws of race; among men we disregard them. There is only one person who knows the racial laws and observes them carefully: The Jew.

If you wish to live, you must fight against the annihilator of our people, for the fate of the middle class is the fate of the German people. Our fighters must come from the ranks of the middle class. Necessity teaches us to pray, but it also teaches us to fight. God gave man prayer, but He refuses to grant the fulfillment of prayer if man does not fight for it. All the disinherited from every side should come together in the ranks of the National Socialists. They all should know that there is one place where faith in the future has not been lost. We need those as fighters who have been uprooted. We need them for rebuilding the future Germany, a Germany founded not on a Jewish basis but on a Germanic basis. . . . This Germany must, moreover, establish the basis of an Aryan *Weltanschauung*. In this regard we must not ask whether it is possible to attain this goal, but whether it is necessary. If it is impossible, then we shall try our best and perish in the attempt; but if it is necessary and proper, then we must believe that it is possible. We need this faith. A thousand years [of German history] look to us, and the future demands sacrifices from us. If we fail, our people will sink into the grave. Whether our people will survive or whether it is doomed to destruction—this is the fateful question. That is why the truth must be told, the truth about the unprecedented world-fraud of the Jews. (Munich, Sept. 29, 1922; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 30, 1922)

The Jewish Peril

Is there still a racial problem in this "modern" world? The yellow race is denied the permission to settle in America. But this peril, comparatively speaking, is not nearly so great as the peril which today stretches its hand over the entire world—the Jewish peril. Many people do not regard the Jews as a race, but is there another people that is as determined to perpetuate its race everywhere in the world as the Jews? As a matter of fact, the Jew can never become a German. If he wanted to become a German he would have to give up being a Jew.

That he cannot do. The Jew cannot become a German at heart for a number of reasons: First, because of his blood; second, because of his character; third, because of his will; and fourth, because of his actions. His actions remain Jewish and he works for the "greater idea" of the Jewish people. Since that is so and cannot be otherwise, the mere existence of the Jew is a colossal lie. The Jew is a past master at lying, for his existence as such in the organism of other peoples is only possible because of falsehood. This already was the opinion of the great Arthur Schopenhauer. The Jew lies to the other peoples when he pretends to be German, French, or the like.

What are the aims of the Jews? They aim to expand their invisible state as a supreme tyranny over the whole world. The Jew is therefore a destroyer of nations. In order to realize his domination over peoples he has to work in two directions. Economically he dominates the peoples, politically and morally he subjugates them. Politically he accomplishes his aims through the propagation of the principles of democracy and the doctrine of Marxism, which makes the proletarian a terrorist in domestic matters and a pacifist in foreign policy. From the ethical point of view the Jew destroys the peoples in respect to religious and moral considerations. Any one who is willing to see that, can see it; and no one can help the person who refuses to see it. The Jew, voluntarily or involuntarily, consciously or unconsciously, undermines the foundation on which alone a nation can exist.

Thus, the following question comes up: Are we still in a position to resist an enemy who is our deadly enemy? The prime consideration is whether we want to save Germany. If so, then we must first save her from her destroyer. I confess, it is a severe struggle that must be fought out on this score. We National Socialists, however, occupy an extreme position in this regard. We know only one people for which we fight, and that is our own people. We may be inhuman, but if we save Germany we will have achieved the greatest thing on earth. We may do wrong, but if we save Germany, we will have righted the greatest wrong on earth. We may be immoral, but if we save our people, morality will have been given a new lease on life.

It is said that we are only making a lot of noise about anti-Semitism. Yes indeed, we want to stir up a storm. The people must not sleep, they should know that a storm is gathering. We have therefore laid down the principle in our program that only Germans can be citizens of the state. We could tolerate Jews only as guests, providing they did us no harm. But they are harmful. (Munich, April 20, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 22/23, 1923)

The Rightness of Racial Instinct

There were times when there was no danger of a Jewish bastardization of the people. A Goethe still had the natural instinct to say: Marriage between a Jew and a Gentile seems to me something against nature; it is impossible and cannot be. For generations, therefore, no laws concerning this question were necessary. Racial instinct protected the people; the odor of that race deterred Gentiles from marrying Jews. At present, in these days of perfume, where any dandy can assume the same odor as anyone else, the feeling for these finer distinctions between peoples is being lost. The Jew counts on that. The eye also becomes accustomed to differences between peoples. In this respect, knowledge must come to our aid. What generations once did instinctively, we must by necessity do consciously, lest we perish. And with that we come to the basic principle of our *Weltanschauung*. Instinct is the sound *Weltanschauung* of the primitive man reared in nature. As long as his instinct remains sound, his *Weltanschauung* is sound. Instinct keeps him from the wrong ways of thinking. (Munich, Nov. 29, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 3, 1929)

The Poison of Semitic Blood

Because I believe in the idea of race I fight in all matters pertaining to public life against the Judaization of our people, against the poisoning of our people with foreign blood. A National Socialist will never tolerate that a foreigner—and that means the Jew—should have a position in public life. He will never tolerate that a foreigner hold a government position. A National Socialist will not even ask, Is he capable? No, my *Weltanschauung* tells me that I must keep our national organism free from foreign blood.

As a National Socialist I will deal with all questions of education in the community as well as in the state from the point of view of the preservation of my blood, that is, the preservation of my people. The people comes first, the state is secondary. The people is the most important consideration; everything else must be made subservient to it alone. An educational system is as it should be if it gives my *Volks-genossen* the power of resistance in all fields, if it makes them recognize the fundamental principles of their own lives. A National Socialist will never tolerate that a non-German should be the educator of a German, that a Jew should be the teacher of our people. If the People's Party (*Volkspartei*) tells us that we have no legal basis, we

answer that it is our state. In our state only a German can be a citizen, and only the citizen can hold public office. You say to us that we have no means of enforcing this. And we answer: All measures which are necessary for the preservation of a people in its substance are justified. (Munich, Nov. 29, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 4, 1929)

Racial Purity

The main plank in the National Socialist program is to abolish the liberalistic concept of the individual and the Marxist concept of humanity and to substitute therefor the folk community, rooted in the soil and bound together by the bond of its common blood. This is a very simple statement, but it involves a principle that has tremendous consequences. This is probably the first time and this is the first country in which the people are being taught to realize that, of all tasks which we have to face, the noblest and most sacred for mankind is that each racial species must preserve the purity of the blood which God has given it. . . . The greatest revolution which National Socialism has brought about is that it has rent asunder the veil which hid from us the knowledge that all human failures and mistakes are due to the conditions of the time and therefore can be remedied, but that there is one error which cannot be remedied once men have made it, namely, the failure to recognize the importance of conserving the blood and the race free from intermixture and thereby the racial aspect and character which are God's gift and God's handiwork. It is not for men to discuss the question of why Providence created different races, but rather to recognize the fact that it punishes those who disregard its work of creation.

Unspeakable suffering and misery have come upon mankind because they lost this instinct which was grounded in a profound intuition; and this loss was caused by a wrong and lopsided education of the intellect. Among our people there are millions and millions of persons living today for whom this law has become clear and intelligible. What individual seers and the still unspoiled natures of our forefathers saw by direct perception has now become a subject of scientific research in Germany. I can prophesy here that, just as the knowledge that the earth moves around the sun led to a revolutionary alteration in the general world-picture, so the blood-and-race doctrine of the National Socialist Movement will bring about a revolutionary change in our knowledge and therewith a radical reconstruction of the picture

which human history gives us of the past and will also change the course of that history in the future.

This will not lead to an estrangement between nations; but, on the contrary, it will bring about for the first time a real understanding of one another. At the same time, however, it will prevent the Jewish people from intruding themselves among all the other nations as elements of internal disruption, under the mask of honest world-citizens, and thus gaining power over these nations.

We feel convinced that the consequences of this revolutionizing vision of truth will bring about a radical transformation in German life. For the first time in our history, the German people have found the way to a higher unity. . . . From that chaos of disunion which had been caused by tribal, dynastic, philosophical, religious and political strife, the German nation has arisen and has unfurled the banner of a reunion which symbolically announces, not a political triumph, but the triumph of the racial principle. . . . The National Socialist Movement limits its sphere of internal activity to those individuals who belong to one people and it refuses to allow the members of a foreign race to wield an influence over our political, intellectual, or cultural life. We refuse to accord to the members of a foreign race any predominant position in our national economic system. In this folk-community, which is based on the bond of blood, and in the results which National Socialism has obtained by making the idea of this community understood among the public, lies the most profound reason for the marvelous success of our Revolution. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1937)

A World-Wide Enemy

German culture, as its name alone shows, is German and not Jewish, and therefore its management and care will be entrusted to members of our own nation. If the rest of the world cries out with a hypocritical mien against this barbaric expulsion from Germany of such an irreplaceable and culturally valuable element, we can only be astonished at this reaction. For how thankful they must be that we are releasing apostles of culture and placing them at the disposal of the rest of the world. In accordance with their own declarations they cannot find a single reason to excuse themselves for refusing to receive this most valuable race in their own countries. Nor can I see a reason why the members of this race should be imposed upon the German nation, while in the states which are so enthusiastic about

these "splendid people," their settlement should suddenly be refused with every imaginable excuse. I think that the sooner this problem is solved the better, for Europe cannot settle down until the Jewish question is cleared up. It may very well be possible that sooner or later an agreement on this problem may be reached in Europe, even between those nations which otherwise do not so easily come together. The world has sufficient space for settlements, but we must once and for all get rid of the opinion that the Jewish race was only created by God for the purpose of being in a certain percentage a parasite living on the body and the productive work of other nations. The Jewish race will have to adapt itself to sound constructive activity. . . .

In the course of my life I have very often been a prophet, and I have usually been ridiculed for it. During the time of my struggle for power, it was in the first instance the Jewish race which received my prophecies with laughter when I said that I would one day take over the leadership of the state, and with it that of the whole nation, and that I would then, among many other things, settle the Jewish problem. . . . Today I will once more be a prophet. If the international Jewish financiers in and outside Europe should succeed in plunging the nations once more into a world war, then the result will not be the Bolshevization of the earth and thus the victory of Jewry, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe, for the time when the non-Jewish nations had no propaganda is at an end. National Socialist Germany and Fascist Italy have institutions which enable them, when necessary, to enlighten the world about the nature of a question of which many nations are instinctively conscious, but which they have not yet clearly thought out.

At the moment the Jews in certain countries may be fomenting hatred under the protection of a press, of the film, of wireless propaganda, of the theater, of literature, and so forth, all of which they control. If this nation should once more succeed in inciting the millions which compose the nations into a conflict which is utterly senseless and only serves Jewish interests, then there will be revealed the effectiveness of an enlightenment which has completely routed the Jews in Germany in the space of a few years. The nations are no longer willing to die on the battlefield so that this unstable international race may profiteer from a war or satisfy its Old Testament vengeance. The Jewish watchword "Workers of the world unite!" will be conquered by a higher realization, namely, "Workers of all classes and of all nations, recognize your common enemy!" (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Extinction Inescapable

I do not even want to speak of the Jews. They are simply our old enemies, their plans have suffered shipwreck through us, and they rightly hate us, just as we hate them. We realize that this war can only end either in the wiping out of the Germanic nations, or by the disappearance of Jewry from Europe. On September 3rd, I spoke in the Reichstag—and I dislike premature prophecies—and I said that this war would not end the way the Jews imagine, that is, in the extinction of the European Aryan nations, but that the result of this war would be the destruction of Jewry. For the first time, it will not be the others who will bleed to death, but for the first time the genuine ancient Jewish law, “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth,” is being applied. The more this struggle spreads, the more anti-Semitism will spread—and world Jewry may rely on this. It will find nourishment in every prison camp, it will find nourishment in every family which is being enlightened as to why it is being called upon to make such sacrifices, and the hour will come when the worst enemy of the world, of all time, will have finished his part for at least one thousand years to come. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1942; B.B.C.)

The Dictatorship of Jewry

We know the theoretical principle and cruel truth about the aims of this world plague [Bolshevism]. It is called the “rule of the proletariat”; it is the “dictatorship of Jewry.” It is the elimination of national leadership and the people’s intelligence. It is the domination of the proletariat, deprived of its leaders and thus defenseless, by the Jewish-international criminals alone. The things that happened in Russia on such a horrifying scale—the extermination of innumerable millions of leading personages—was to continue in Germany. If this intention failed, the reasons were our people’s healthy power of resistance and the lack of courage on the Bolshevik side—led exclusively by Jews—and lack of unanimous consent on the part of the proletariat. Nevertheless, some parts of the Reich experienced those conditions, during which many an idealist was killed. The curse of this work of Satan weighed heavily upon Hungary; there, too, it was possible to break the power of Jewish violence only by the nation resorting to force. . . .

Concurrently with this historic event [the defeat of Jewish-Bolshevism by Fascist Italy], the National Socialist Movement began to

grow among our own people and to carry out its mission. Here, too, came the hour when, in a conflict between Jewish internationalism and the National Socialist conception of state and people, the healthy principles of nature broke through. In most other European countries this conflict was also fought out. But with this difference—that in some countries it was at first covered up by a compromise, whereas in others it was temporarily eliminated with the help of the state. All of us remember, however, the latest and the decisive duel in Spain where, under the leadership of one man a clear and unequivocal decision was forced; and where, after a bloody civil war, the national revolution conquered the Bolshevik arch-enemy.

The growing recognition of the Jew as the parasitic germ which causes these illnesses forced during the last few years state after state in Europe to clarify its position. They had to take the necessary measures to protect their own people against that form of international poisoning. Although Bolshevik Russia is the classic prototype of Jewish infection, we must not forget that democratic capitalism created the conditions for its growth. Here the Jews prepare what they complete in the second phase of the process. In the first phase they deprive the masses of their rights, reducing them to helpless slaves or, as they say themselves, to expropriated proletarians, to incite the fanatical masses to destroy the core of their state. Later on, the destruction of their national intelligentsia follows and, at last, there follows the removal of the elements of culture embodying the inheritance of thousands of years. . . . What remains is the brute in man and the Jewish class which, gaining power, destroys the fostering soil which nourished it. The awakening young Europe has declared war on that process of decomposition carried out by the Jews (as Mommsen called it). With them are allied proud nations of other continents. Hundreds of millions of people will gather around them, subjugated peoples who will one day break their chains, whatever the opinion of their present leaders may be. Death will come to all the liars, who, pretending to protect the world against domination by a foreign power, in reality are only endeavoring to save their own world domination. (Berlin, April 26, 1942; B.B.C.)

6

God and Providence

Lord God! We promise thee that for our liberty we will make sacrifices to our last breath and unto this purpose we ask thy blessing.

Munich, June 10, 1923

He who believes in God must acknowledge that when in three days the fate of nations change, then that is a judgment of God.

Klagenfurt, April 4, 1938

Since Hitler has always represented himself as chosen by God to lead the Aryan race, his fanatical followers have from the outset been encouraged to cast him in the role of the German Messiah. Consistent with the Providential motif, he assured his early audiences that he would carry on his struggle for the regeneration of Germany so long as it pleased God to let him fight.

After 1933 the Fuehrer's mysticism took on even more studied characteristics. Every Nazi success on the home front was explained as a blessing from heaven. As his foreign policy became more aggressive, the obligato of his oratory became increasing religious. His speeches during the Rhineland crisis of 1936 abounded in mystical appeals and practically every address on the Anschluss with Austria explained that event as decreed by Providence. Since the outbreak of World War II, Hitler has tried to convince the Germans that the fate of their country embodies the will of God. On this basis he has explained all German victories, and, now that defeat is imminent, he hopes to wring the last ounce of loyalty and sacrifice from the people by reversing the argument and insisting that God's blessings will flow only to those who deserve them.

Charismatic leadership has been a clever ruse in Hitler's hands. And so long as he appeared to be a miracle man it worked wonders. But, like all such phenomena, it recoils quite disadvantageously when events reveal the false premises upon which it is based.

By connecting the fundamental message in the present chapter with the basic doctrine of force and power in Chapters 1 and 2, we arrive at the core of Hitler's theology. His deity is manifested in the jungle law of tooth and claw which knows only the blessed extermination of the weak by the strong.

God's Cooperation

We do not imagine that success will be presented to our Movement as a gift. We shall have to face the most difficult struggle and to make innumerable sacrifices to reach our goal. We know that Germany cannot be made free by folding our hands in our laps. Every effort will be required to achieve this freedom. We are a group of men who recognize that the highest good is worth the greatest effort. We are not a Party of lazy, narrow-minded townsmen; we are not a Movement of worthless brothers, who are content to discuss the topics of the day, who as men say to their wives: My dear wife, the Lord has given, the Lord has taken away, praised be the will of the Lord; if it pleases Him, He will make us free again. No! The Lord gave us His blessing because we deserved it; the Lord revoked His blessing because we were not worthy of it; the Lord will give us His blessing again when He sees that He has a rejuvenated people before Him. (Munich, April 2, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 5, 1927)

In the Image of the Lord

When we come forth today as Germans and try to guard against infection by another people, then we attempt to put back into the hand of the all-powerful Creator that which He has given us.

His will and His Providence let us become what we are. He gave us the blood that we possess; He gave us our external, I might almost say purely human appearance; He placed our souls in us and He gave us the value which is ours and also the substance of life. It would be an act of infidelity toward the Creator if we did not endeavor to give the same being back to Him in the same form in which He gave it to us. I consider it a sin to corrupt or to debase this our being, to infect it with foreign characteristics, and thus not to preserve the image of God as He placed it in our inner nature.

And when I trace the development of our Movement in the last eleven years, I must say that in this Movement a miracle has been performed, an absolute miracle. From seven men a Movement has arisen which, in spite of the opposition of all kinds of so-called legal power, and in spite of the so-called facts, comprises the entire German nation. From out of nothing a symbol for millions of Germans has come forth which for the first time welds them solidly together in a struggle against a threatening and hostile philosophy and also against its effects. And when it is said to me as many have: How can you carry

your heathenish symbol in the van of this struggle when the Christian Cross alone is called to lead it? To that I say: This symbol is not directed against the Christian Cross. On the contrary, it is the political manifestation of what the Christian Cross intends or must intend. For, in the last analysis, one cannot designate the struggle which, for example, the Center Party or the Bavarian People's Party conducts as the struggle of the Christian Cross. I believe that if now suddenly Christ, our Lord, should appear among this unfortunate German people and one were to induce him to take a stand in this political struggle—I do not believe that Christ, our Lord, would go and seek out a place within the ranks of the Center Party in the German Reichstag!

To be sure, our Christian Cross should be the most exalted symbol of the struggle against the Jewish-Marxist-Bolshevik spirit. But then the parties, however, which come to terms with Marxism, with Atheism, indeed with the refined form of the same which Bolshevism represents, should not advertise the Cross of Christ as their party symbol. One should from the very beginning, however, preserve this Cross from any political contact until the structure of these political parties again become worthy of association with this symbol, until these parties again pursue policies which are in keeping with the inner significance of this symbol. (Munich, Oct. 25, 1930; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 28, 1930)

The Help of Heaven

If Heaven means well with this Movement, then Heaven will let it fight on more and more. Today we fight for the future of the German people, tomorrow for the future of our race. We have been blessed by fate. Never in the world has a revolutionary idea come forward more rapidly than ours. We believe in victory because the highest powers are active in us. We hope in victory because Germany's youth is with us. We are convinced that victory will come because our will will conquer adversity. (Braunschweig, Oct. 18, 1931; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 20, 1931)

The Creator's Backing

What is it that fate wishes? . . . If the events of the past year should have any inner meaning, then it could only be that fate itself wants things clarified. We see in our own people the fulfillment

of that passage in the Bible which states that that which is hot and that which is cold is accepted, but that which is lukewarm is condemned to be spewed out. The middle parties are cut asunder and destroyed. Compromises are coming to an end. Through National Socialism the German nation today stands out against international Bolshevism. The Almighty Himself through His merciful will creates the conditions for the deliverance of our people. In that He permits the destruction of the lukewarm, He wishes thereby to give us victory. (Munich, Jan. 1, 1932; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 1, 1932)

If the Almighty So Resolves

The Movement will carry on its struggle until the day when the last and greatest goal is reached, until out of the 13,000,000 adherents there emerge 30,000,000, 40,000,000, 50,000,000, until the German people embrace a political philosophy and we have finally solved the question of German existence. . . . We hope that we have been chosen by fate to fulfill this mission and that the Almighty so resolves. For we have the will and the faith and mutual comradeship. We are also loyal and the German youth of the German people are with us. (Munich, July 4, 1932; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, July 5, 1932)

Victory Through Faith

We do not pray to the Almighty: Lord make us free. We wish to be active, to work, to behave as brothers one to another, and to strive together until the hour comes when we can appear before the Lord and beseech him: Lord, thou seest that we have become different, that the German people is no more a people without honor, a people covered with shame, a people at war within itself, a people of little courage. No, Lord, the German people has become strong again, strong in its spirit, strong in its will, strong in its perseverance, and strong in making every sacrifice. Lord, we will not let thee go! Now, bless our day and our freedom, and therewith our German people and fatherland. (Berlin, May 1, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 2, 1933)

God's Blessing

Today I have come here to you as a witness and as a crusader for this fellowship, which today binds together the millions of German people. I know that Heaven gives nothing to men in perfect form. Man must earn his due through bitter hard work. I know, too, that

our goal is today far from being attained. But we strive toward it with burning hearts, and Heaven and Providence have blessed our efforts. Therefore, I can well say: May the internal enemies of Germany and the enemies of the German people in general consider this fact: Fifteen years ago I began the struggle for Germany with a mere handful of followers. It was difficult to grow beyond this mere handful into our immediate surroundings, into the cities, into the states, and finally from the single states into the whole German Reich.

Fifteen years of struggle. And when today I here consider the result, then I must thank God above; he has blessed our efforts time and again. Nor was our struggle in vain. Fifteen years of battle for a Reich, and today in the name of this people and in the name of this Reich I can greet you in the German homeland. (Saarbruecken, March 1, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 2, 1935)

The Lord's Will

As you stand here gathered together before me, may you one and all forget what life has made out of you as individuals; may you remember that in spite of all these barriers you are members of one people and that you are so not by human will but by God's will. It was He who made us members of this nation, He who gave us our mother tongue, He who implanted in us that being with which we are filled, which we must obey if we are to be more on earth than mere worthless chaff. (Berlin, May 1, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 2, 1935)

Holy Handiwork

God continues to bestow His Grace only on him who continues to merit it. But whoever speaks and acts in the name of a people, which is a part of God's handiwork, will continue to discharge his mandate only so long as he does not sin against the existence or future of the part of God's creation that has been entrusted to his care. . . .

We, my comrades and my co-leaders of the people and the Army, have been marked by fate to be makers of history in the highest sense of that term. Providence has given us what has been withheld from millions of men. In looking back on our work, future ages will still remember us. The most striking feature of our work and the most remarkable for posterity will be the fact that, in an epoch of general disloyalty and treason, it was possible at that time in Germany to

form a union and weld together a band of followers whose loyalty is incomparable. And we know that a page of the world's history will be consecrated to us, as the men who came from the ranks of the National Socialist Party and the army and built up and consolidated the new German Reich. Then in the Pantheon of History we shall stand side by side, associated forever in loyal comradeship, as in the time of our great struggle and its great triumph. (Nuremberg, Sept. 16, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 17, 1935)

God's Voice Is the People's Voice

Flattery and threats will not alter my point of view. In the last few days there have been attempts to win me over by compliments and warnings. My only wish, however, is to be regarded with honor in the history of the German people. If others praise me, that does not affect me. Threats, warnings, disapprobation by the outside world, that is all the same to me. With the certainty of a somnambulist I will continue on the path which Providence has shown me. . . . Above every earthly judge stands the Almighty God. It is His place to decide what is right and what is not right. God's voice is in this case the people's voice. You my *Volksgenossen*, are therefore, my judge, you alone. (Munich, March 14, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 16, 1936)

Up From Misery

My German *Volksgenossen*, there is much in regard to our history and in the sight of our eternal God that we must make good. Once the mercy of God shone upon us, but we were not worthy of His mercy. Providence withdrew its protection and our people fell, fell as scarcely any other people heretofore. In this deep misery we again learned to pray. We learned to respect one another; we began to believe again in the virtues of our people, and we tried once more to better ourselves. So it is that a new community has arisen; and this people of today cannot be compared with the people that has gone before it. . . . This people has become better, more respectable, and nobler. We all perceive it; the mercy of the Lord slowly returns to us again. And in this hour we sink to our knees and beseech our Almighty God that He may bless us, that He may give us the strength to carry on the struggle for the freedom, the future, the honor, and the peace of our people. So help us God. (Cologne, March 28, 1936; *Koelnische Zeitung*, March 30, 1936)

Divine Assistance

Today I must humbly thank Providence, whose grace has enabled me, once an unknown soldier in the war, to bring to a successful issue the struggle for the restoration of our honor and rights as a nation. . . . As I look back on the great work that has been done during the past four years, you will understand quite well that my first feeling is simply one of thankfulness to our Almighty God for having allowed me to bring this work to a successful conclusion. He has blessed our labors and has enabled our people to come through all the obstacles which encompassed them on their way. . . .

Fate has often decreed that men who have a special mission to fulfill must be lonely and deserted. But here I wish to return thanks to Providence for having given me a group of faithful comrades who linked their lives with mine and have ever since fought at my side for the resurrection of our people. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1937)

Prayer

In this hour I pray that the Almighty will give His blessing in the years to come to our work and action, to our judgment and to our strength of resolution, that He may guard us from false pride as from cowardly submission, that He will let us find the right way, which He in His Providence has allotted to the German people, and that He give us always the courage to do right and never to waver or weaken in the face of any force or danger. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

Providential Mission

When I once departed from this city, I carried with me the very same confession of faith that fills me today. Imagine my inner feeling, after so many years, to have brought my confession of faith to its realization. If Providence once called me from out of this city to the leadership of the Reich, then Providence must thereby have given me a mission and it could only have been the mission of giving my dear homeland back to the German Reich. I have believed in this mission, I have lived for it, fought for it. And I believe that I have now fulfilled this mission. You are all witnesses and warranters for this. (Linz, March 12, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 13, 1938)

What God Hath Joined Together

The Lord God created the nations. What He joins together man should never put asunder. As a holy symbol of this fact the entire nation should come forth on April 10th.* I have summoned the nation not only here but in the entire Reich. Today I again lead the way as I did in the period of my struggle and my battle for the German people. On April 10th we shall all give our vote together. For the first time in the history of our people a Reich will be established which will be based on the will of the people itself. In the future I wish to be nothing more than that which I was in the past. The monitor of my people, the teacher of my people, the *Fuehrer* of my people. For all time to come I shall subscribe to only one commandment which has held me duty bound since my birth: Germany! (Graz, April 3, 1938; *Frankfurter Zeitung*, April 5, 1938)

The Choice of Providence

If fate led a young man forth out of his homeland and brought him to the position in which I find myself today, then it is self-evident that this man would think of his homeland more and more. I believe that the period in which I now lead Germany is a historical period of German greatness. I believe that posterity and German history will substantiate the fact that I, in the period of my leadership, brought the highest good to the German people. I have never yet appeared before the German nation with a clearer conscience or with a more superb confidence. I know on April 10th the entire German people will give its greatest historical avowal. . . . The tenth of April will be a great day in German history. We must all feel happy that Providence has chosen us to establish this day. (Salzburg, April 6, 1938; *Neue Freie Presse*, April 7, 1938)

It Was God's Will

I believe that it was also God's will to send a boy from here to the Reich, to let him grow up, to lift him to be *Fuehrer* of the nation, in order to make it possible for him to lead his homeland back to the Reich. There is a higher destiny, and we are all nothing but its instruments. When on March 9th, Herr Schuschnigg broke his agree-

*April 10th was the date of the general election which was held after the annexation of Austria.

ment, I felt in that instant that the call of Providence had now come to me. What then happened in three days is only explicable as the consummation of the wish and will of this same Providence. In three days the Lord felled them. And to me was given the grace to be able on the day of the betrayal to incorporate my homeland into the Reich.

When we are no longer on this earth, then future generations should look upon this day [April 10] with pride—as the day of the ratification of the German community (*Gemeinschaft*) by a great people. Millions of German men have given their blood for this Reich in the past. A merciful decree of fate has made it possible for us to build this Reich today without the grief of former times.

German people, arise now, subscribe to this Reich, and hold it firmly in your hands. I wish to thank Him who permitted me to return to my homeland so that I could now lead it back into my German Reich! May every German tomorrow realize the significance of the hour, consider its importance and bow in humility before the will of the Almighty who in a few weeks has performed a miracle for us. (Vienna, April 9, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 10, 1938)

— Divine Guidance

I can give expression to my deepest feeling only in the form of humble thanks to Providence, who called upon me and vouchsafed to me, once an unknown soldier of the Great War, to rise to be the Leader of my people so dear to me. Providence showed me the way to free our people from its deepest misery without bloodshed and to lead it upward once again. Providence has granted that I might fulfill the one and only task of my life: To raise my German people out of the depths of defeat and to liberate it from the bonds of the most infamous dictate of all times. This alone has been the aim of my actions. . . . I should have sinned against the mission which Providence designed for me had I failed in my endeavor to lead my native country and my people of the *Ostmark* [Austria] back to the Reich and thus to the community of the German people. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

Poland's Plight

It is not that the Pole was a coward or that he merely ran away from us; no, indeed. In many places he fought valiantly. Nevertheless—a state of over 36,000,000 inhabitants mobilizing approximately 50

divisions, a state having an average annual recruiting capacity of close to 300,000, as compared with one of 120,000 in France—this state was defeated by our army in not more than ten days, was overcome in eighteen days, and was forced to capitulate completely in thirty days.

We are fully conscious that Providence was on our side. It was Providence that permitted us to frame our plans correctly and that so evidently blessed their accomplishment. Without Providence our tasks could not have been completed in so short a time. Thus we may believe that it was the decree of Providence that everything should happen as it did. As I have often told you in the past, our defeat in 1918 was deserved—deserved by us because we did not know how to take right and due advantage of our great victories. Such a reproach shall not be levied at us again. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 10, 1939)

Divine Destiny

There is a God. This God creates the nations. Fundamentally He gives all peoples the same right. We Germans conducted ourselves very poorly 20, 22, or 23 years ago. There was a revolution and we were consequently defeated. Then began the resurrection of our people through incalculable work. During this entire time Providence again blessed our work. The braver we were, the more we received the blessing of Providence. In the past six years too the blessing of Providence has always accompanied us. For believe me, one may call it luck, another call it something else, but without this final assent no one indeed can complete great works. Just a few months ago I again personally felt in the deepest sense the hand of Providence which guides man and assigns his tasks to him. We serve those tasks. What we want is not the oppression of other peoples, it is our freedom, our security, the security of our living-space. It is the security of the very life of our people. That is what we are fighting for.

Up until now Providence blessed this struggle, blessed it a thousand times. Could it have done that, would it have done that, if it had been the intention of Providence suddenly now to let this fight go against us? I believe in this respect in a higher and eternal justice. It is bestowed on him who proves himself worthy of it. That was my belief with which I came onto the scene here for the first time twenty years ago. At that time I believed, "It is not possible that my people is destined to decline. It will only decline if no man appears to

rescue this people. But if someone with a faithful heart champions this people again and works for it, and does everything for this people, then it cannot be that Providence will let this people perish." Providence has done more than wonders for us since then. (Munich, Feb. 24, 1940; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 26, 1940)

God Helps Those Who Help Themselves

The Lord helps those who help themselves. . . . That is not only a very pious phrase, but a very just one. For one cannot assume that God exists to help people who are too cowardly and too lazy to help themselves and think that God exists only to make up for the weakness of mankind. He does not exist for that purpose. He has always, at all times, blessed only those who were prepared to fight their own battles. We have seen what can be expected from the help of others. . . .

Providence has not led us along these amazing paths in vain. On the day that the Party was founded I recalled that our nation once gained immense victories. Then it became ungrateful, disunited, sinned against itself. Thereupon it was punished by Providence. We deserved our defeat. If a nation forgets itself as completely as the German nation did at that time, if it thinks that it can shake off all honor and all good faith, Providence can do nothing but teach it a hard and bitter lesson. But even at that time we were convinced that once our nation found itself again, once it again became industrious and honorable, once each individual German stood up for his nation first and not for himself, once he placed the interests of the community above his own personal interests, once the whole nation again pursued a great ideal, once it was prepared to stake everything for this ideal, the hour would come when the Lord would declare our trials at an end.

If fate should once more call us to the battlefield, the blessing of Providence will be with those who have merited it by years of hard work. When I compare myself and my opponents in other countries in the light of history, I do not fear the verdict on our respective mentalities. Who are these egoists? Each one of them merely defends the interests of his class. Behind them all stands either the Jew or their own moneybags. They are all nothing but money grubbers, living on the profits of this war. . . . I am convinced that our struggle will in the future be blessed by Providence, as it has been blessed up to now. (Munich, Feb. 24, 1941; *Berliner Boersen Zeitung*, Feb. 25, 1941)

Gratitude to the Creator

If Providence has so willed that the German people cannot be spared this fight, then I can only be grateful that it entrusted me with the leadership in this historic struggle which, for the next 500 or 1,000 years, will be described as decisive, not only for the history of Germany, but for the whole of Europe and indeed the whole world. The German people and their soldiers are working and fighting today, not only for the present, but for the coming, nay the most distant generations. A historical revision on a unique scale has been imposed on us by the Creator. . . .

Our enemies must not deceive themselves—in the 2,000 years of German history known to us, our people have never been more united than today. The Lord of the Universe has treated us so well in the past years that we bow in gratitude to a Providence which has allowed us to be members of such a great nation. We thank Him that we also can be entered with honor into the everlasting book of German history! (Berlin, Dec. 12, 1941; B.B.C.)

Preservation for Peace

Once war is inevitable, I should prefer to direct it myself, not because I am longing for fame; on the contrary, I gladly renounce any fame in this case. In my opinion, this is not real fame. If Providence should preserve my life, my fame will consist some day in the great works of peace, which I intend to create. But because I believe that if Providence has ordained that this struggle will have to be fought according to the inscrutable will of this Providence, I can only ask Providence that it entrust me with the burden of this fight, that it burdens me with it. I will bear it, and shall shirk no responsibility. In every hour I will shoulder the burden, will bear every responsibility as I have borne them so far. . . .

It is this prayer which will be answered: God give us strength that we may maintain our freedom for our people, for our children and for our children's children, not only for us Germans, but also for the other nations of Europe! For this war which we are all fighting this time is not a war for Germany alone; it is a war for the whole of Europe and thus really for the whole of mankind. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1942; B.B.C.)

Nazism Will Conquer

I speak to you as the leader of armies which have mastered a fate Providence imposes as the hardest trial only on those receiving the highest call. If it be true that the gods love only those who demand the impossible from them, it is equally true that the Lord blesses only those who remain steadfast even in an impossible situation. . . .

In this struggle, truth will conquer in the end, and truth is with us. That Providence has selected me in such tremendous times to lead the German people is my sole pride. I will bind my name and my life inextricably with its destiny. I have no other request to make to the Almighty than to bless us in the future as in the past and to let me live only so long as in His eyes it is necessary for the fateful struggle of the German people. For there can be no greater glory than in difficult times to lead a people and to bear the responsibility. (Berlin, April 26, 1942; B.B.C.)

Of, By and For the People

I am a child of the people and I will remain so forever . . . and if necessary I would let myself be cut into pieces for this people.

Sommerfeld, Oct. 20, 1932

I am nothing but a magnet which continually sweeps over the German nation and draws the steel from the people.

Munich, Feb. 24, 1940

Hitler rose to power in Germany and to domination over Europe with the support of the German masses. Of necessity his remarkable hold on them would not have been possible without deeply-rooted conditioning factors. The bitter disillusionment of defeat in 1918, the Versailles Treaty, general impoverishment through inflation and depression, political and social disintegration—all these frustrating circumstances left the German people with a profound hunger for belief, with an eager willingness to be led. Weighed down by a feeling of inferiority, they thrilled at the Fuehrer's message of national regeneration and the righteous imprecations studding his speeches.

Hitler's strong personal belief in Germany's destiny stirred every audience and the fanaticism of his Glaube an Deutschland was well-nigh infectious. In days of deep despair, he dared to prophesy a Reich that would extend from Koenigsberg to Strassburg, from Hamburg to Vienna. Few could question his patriotism. Had he not fought in battle that Germany might live? His incessant self-characterization as a "simple, unknown soldier" encouraged his hearers to identify themselves with him. Highly important to his success has been his constant reference to himself as a "son of the people."

Both the peasant and the worker have been flattered and cajoled into supporting the Fuehrer. Each has been promised an exalted status in the New Order. And each has been impressed by his fulminations against economic inequities and class distinctions.

Hitler has used other methods of mass control: tension and terror. He has kept the Volk at a high nervous pitch and in an unthinking frame of mind by manufacturing one crisis after another. To make sure that his regimentation is effective, he has employed his ubiquitous and ruthless Gestapo to hound the country night and day.

Many Germans have been hopelessly caught in a cruel vise of tyranny and oppression, but not all of them have been hapless pawns of Nazism. A vital question that must be taken into account when assessing Hitler's power is the degree of mass acceptance which has resulted from voluntary cooperation.

Love, Hope, and Faith

There are three words, which are used by many without a thought, but which for us are more than catchwords: Love, Hope, Faith. We National Socialists want to love and learn to love our Fatherland, to learn to love it jealously, it alone, and not to tolerate any other gods before it.

We have only one interest, and that is our people. We love our people fanatically and we are determined that so-called "national governments" should know this. We can go along as faithfully as dogs with those who are serious about our love for our people, but we can persecute with fanatic hatred those who think they can take advantage of this love. We cannot cooperate with governments who squint to both sides, to the right and to the left. We aim straightforward. It is either love or hate.

We believe in the eternal rights of our people. We protest against the assumption that every people is supposed to have rights except ours. We must learn to acquire this blind faith in the rights of our people, the belief in the necessity to serve this right, and the belief that such a fanatic conviction eventually must be victorious. Out of this love and this faith there emerges for us the conception of hope. If others despair and are doubtful of Germany's future—we do not despair. We hope and believe that Germany will and must again become great and powerful. We hope and believe that the day will come when Germany will reach from Koenigsberg to Strassburg and from Hamburg to Vienna. We believe that someday Heaven will unite all Germans in one Reich, not under the Soviet star or the Jewish star of David, but under the Swastika, the symbol of German work. Then the first of May will have really come. (Munich, May 1, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 3, 1923)

A German—First, Last, and Always

While all Germany capitulated, while the Reich fell apart, while all about us we heard nothing but empty talk, we built up a Movement which consciously opposed those who cry: I am a member of a party, I am a Monarchist, a Republican, a Catholic, or a Protestant; I am from the middle class or from the proletariat. We built up a Movement whose watchword is: Above all I am a German. As a German I feel myself one with the fate of my people. It is the highest honor to be the friend of one's people, to declare oneself one of them

at a time when that people is abused and oppressed. Neither the middle class nor the working class will give Germany her freedom. German liberty will be won the day that the German fist and the German brain become one again. We can no longer remake this old world and we should not try to do it; that is why we are calling upon youth, upon our comrades from the war, upon the young workers, and upon everyone in Germany who has remained young in mind and in heart. That is the greatest thing we have given the German people. In the midst of ruin we have given the people a new Movement, a Movement which embraces both the brain worker and the daily laborer, which even now marches forward, a Movement in which a former Communist serves as a file leader and at the same time counts a former "reactionary" officer among its adherents. All of these have come to the realization that a new life is possible, that there can be no social happiness, no national liberty, unless the German people takes new pride in itself and closes the most gaping wound it now has—social cleavage. . . .

If a Movement is to be strong enough to forge German destiny anew some day, then this Movement itself must be of the best of steel. The Movement which someday will take over the responsibility of the German Reich must itself first be forged by destiny. The Republic and Marxism both are fashioning the weapons for the struggle for the coming Third Reich; the former by persecuting and oppressing us, by gagging us and throwing us into jail; the latter by sending its murderers against us. That does not terrify us; it spurs us on to greater faith! We know why they do this, and we are proud of it. From each persecution the Movement emerges stronger, until a rock of granite is left on which they break their teeth. We do not consider that the German Republic is as strong as granite. Thus, the Movement has given the German people one thing, namely, love of the German people.

In the second place, we have given the people the belief that it is not doomed. I beg each one of you—go to a meeting of one of the old patriotic parties, and then come to us. Then you will realize: There—lethargy, at the most empty words; here—absolute faith, here these hundreds of brownshirts, who are standing and saluting and each one of whom has a gleam in his eye, namely, faith in the future. When you look at these people and learn to know this Movement, then you will notice a third thing: The unlimited hope and confidence in the vital force of the people. You will see thousands of examples of heroism, which will strengthen your hope tremendously. Here the former front soldier sees that a new world is opening up; that the

shock troops of the new Germany have been formed. He who sees this struggle sees the will to struggle, the will to resist, nowhere to surrender. We will break the terror of the Communists, for we will fight terror with terror. If we are asked—another clash? Why do you not keep peace? There shall be peace only after the November crime has been avenged. Our disturbances consist only in the fact that we protect German rights.

This is the new front, which takes the place of the broken-down state of classes, political parties, castes, occupations, and confessions. This is the new front, which has solved the concept of what is national and what is social by melting the two into one, and discovered that the socialist and the nationalist is that person who in the best sense of the word supports the interests of the people as a whole, who in the field of foreign fights for the rights of his people, which has outgrown the curse of social cleavage of former years, a people unified in the belief of the necessity of struggle. . . . Never will the head of the National Socialists be bowed. They can disband us; they can suppress us, but they cannot bend us. They can kill us, but they can never convert us through persons of different convictions. And so it will be, until someday all the best Germans will be incorporated in this army, and the framework of Versailles will begin to totter, and the chains we have so patiently worn will begin to clank and clatter. Then the words of the poet will become reality: The people rise up, the storm breaks loose. (Munich, Nov. 21, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 22, 1928)

Up From the Depths

It will be the steadfast aim of the Movement which I and my fellow-workers represent to exalt the word "worker" to the greatest title of honor in the German nation. . . . Personally, I am against honorary titles and I do not think any one can reproach me very much for this. What is not absolutely necessary for me to do I do not do. I should never care to have visiting cards printed with the titles which in this world are given with such ceremony. . . . All the same, owing to the peculiar circumstances of my life, I am perhaps more capable than anyone else of understanding the nature and the life of the various German classes. It is not because I have been able to observe this life from the high ranks but because I have participated in it, because fate in a moment of caprice, or perhaps fulfilling the designs of Providence, cast my lot in that of the great masses. It is because I myself was a laboring man for years, because for the second time I

lived among the masses as a common soldier. And then fate lifted me into another class of our people so that I learned to know this class better than many another. Thus fate has perhaps destined me more than anyone else to be—I can apply this word to myself—an honest broker, an honest broker for both sides.

I am not personally interested here. I am neither dependent on the state, nor on an official office, nor am I dependent on any industrial or economic concern nor on the trade unions. I am an independent man and I have set myself no other aim than to serve the German people to the best of my ability and above all to be of service to those millions who, thanks to their trusting simplicity and, above all, to the ignorance and wickedness of their leaders, have perhaps suffered most of all. It has always been my idea that there can be nothing finer than to be the advocate of those who cannot defend themselves. (Berlin, May 10, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 11, 1933)

*United Support**

We know that the German nation is behind us. If men on their own responsibility make promises which they cannot keep, and know that they cannot keep them, or make promises which affront their honor, let these men come to an understanding with themselves. We cannot do such a thing because we should disgrace by such a promise the nation which stands behind us. As for myself, I declare that I should rather die at any time than sign anything which, according to my innermost conviction, would be intolerable for the German people.

I beseech the entire German people, if I should ever fail in this regard, if the people should ever believe that it could not support my measures, then the people can execute me. I will offer no opposition. Never will I do anything that will violate my honor or the honor of the nation. I should not like to have a hand in disgracing the German people. We want peace, we want understanding, but we also want our honor, our equal rights. We do not want to be treated any longer as a second-rate nation. I beg that the German nation will now submit itself to this idea. I have never been afraid of the people. I have always represented the idea that my actions will stand before the entire people. May the people judge me . . . and may it judge our policy. (Berlin, Oct. 24, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 26, 1933)

*This statement and that of November 10th were expressed during the election campaign which followed Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference on October 14, 1933. The election was held on November 12th.

A Member of No Class

When I speak to you today and thus to millions of other German workers, I have more right to do this than anyone else. I have grown out of you yourselves; once I myself stood among you, I was among you in the war for four and one-half years and now I speak to you to whom I belong, with whom I feel myself to be bound still today, and for whom in the final analysis I carry on the struggle. As far as I was concerned the struggle was not necessary. Nor would I wage it for a class or any certain stratum of society. I lead the struggle for the masses of millions of our honest, industriously working, and creative people. . . .

In my youth I was a worker like you, and then I worked my way up by industry, by study, and, I can say, by starving. In my innermost being, however, I have always remained what I was before. When, after the war, I entered political life, I did so with the conviction that our people was poorly advised by its political leadership, that a horrible future awaited the German people as a result of this bad leadership. I acted then with the most sincere self-justification because I did not belong to those who were in any way responsible for the war. I was just as little responsible for the war as anyone among you, for at that time I was, just like you, an unknown person, whom fate passed over in the order of the day. In any case I have not counted myself among those who set themselves against their own nation at the time.

I was convinced that one had to enter the struggle for the destiny of the nation, if sooner or later the entire people was not to suffer a terrible ordeal. That is what separated me from the others who turned against Germany. When the war was over I, as a front soldier, assumed the right to represent that which I had recognized to be right. Before this I had not made any speeches, nor had I engaged in any activity. I was simply a man who earned his daily bread. Not until I saw after the conclusion of the war that the political leadership did not live up to what it had promised the nation, but that the contrary was true, did I go among the people and work with six other quite insignificant workers and found a Movement. . . .

I began with six or seven men. Today it is the greatest German Movement; this is so not by chance and not because the way was made easy for me, but because the ideas upon which I built are right. It was only for this reason that they could be carried through. For you can imagine, my workers, that when a man in your station in life be-

gins a Movement, success does not just fly to him. That is self-understood. One needs great tenacity and a tremendous will to begin such an enterprise at all. And I should like to say this to you: If I had this faith, I had it only because I know the people and because I had no doubts as to the quality of the German people. The intellectual groups did not give me the courage to begin this gigantic work; I took courage only because I knew the German worker and the German peasant. I knew that these two classes would one day become the bearers of the new Reich and that the group of intellectual workers would also join them of itself. A gigantic program! When I was called on January 30th, after a bitter struggle of fourteen years, I had only one wish and that was to fulfill this great task. What does a title mean to me? I do not need a title. My name, which I achieved with my own strength, is my title. I only wish that posterity would sometime confirm the fact that I have striven to achieve my program decently and honestly. . . .

In Germany I am the guarantor that this community will not work out to the advantage of any element of our German people. You can look upon me as the man who belongs to no class, who belongs to no group, who is above all such considerations. I have nothing but my connection with the German people. To me everyone is entirely equal. What interest do the intellectuals have for me, the middle class, or the proletariat? I am interested only in the German people. I belong exclusively to the German people and I struggle for the German people. And on November 12th, I shall introduce this German people to the world as it is! The world shall see that what I say is not the language of an individual but that the entire people stands behind it to a man. (Berlin, Nov. 10, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 11, 1933)

Fighter for the Multitude

When on January 30th, a year ago, our General Field Marshal, our highly esteemed President of the nation, by means of a decision, truly magnanimous in view of everything that had happened and preceded it, entrusted me with the formation and leadership of the government of Germany, the National Socialist Party shouldered a responsibility the greatness of which did not seem to correspond to its influence or to the part it had previously played. At that time, with only two Ministers, I entered a cabinet which then held a reserved opinion of the Movement and of me personally, and I gave the nation

my promise to tackle the tasks imposed upon us by history and Providence and to seek for them a comprehensive solution.

In that hour I considered myself to be only a representative of and a fighter for my people. I was convinced that even if, at that moment, a countless multitude inevitably lacked an understanding of the true meaning of the mission which our Movement had to perform, nevertheless in a short time our actual deeds would meet with the intuitive assent of the nation. Thus from that historical hour, I have never conceived my mission to be other than one of the whole German nation, even if consciously or unconsciously millions of men then did not realize this fact or possibly did not want to believe it.

I have never seen in purely outward power any possible substitute for the confidence of the nation, but have always honestly striven to convert the power of authority into the strength of confidence. I can, therefore, admit with pride that just as the National Socialist Party had its roots exclusively in the people, so we as a government have never had any thought which did not originate in the people, with the people, and for the people. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

One Great Community

Great tasks have always been performed only by strong leadership, but the strongest leadership must fail when there is not a loyal, really strong and independent people behind it. It is the misfortune of humanity that its leadership only too often forgets that the ultimate strength does not reside in divisions and regiments, not in cannons and tanks, but that the greatest strength for any leadership lies in the people itself, in its unanimity, in its inner solidity and in its idealistic faith. That is the strength that can in the last analysis move mountains of resistance! For this, however, an idea is by all means necessary, an idea which the nation understands, an idea which it comprehends and which it loves. When in the year 1919 we first came forth as the preachers of the national idea, we were quite a small group of idealists, ridiculed at that time, or, as they said, we were visionaries. Today the critics are confuted. . . . Everything that we have done would have been impossible, everything that we have done could never have come about . . . if the German people had not experienced an inner change. That we succeeded in giving the German people a new idea and in leading this people to a new way of life, is the greatest accomplishment of the century for our people. . . .

We see in the first of May a symbol of this accomplishment. It is a day which was not chosen and organized by us in this form in vain. There may be many people who, perhaps even today still standing apart, ask themselves the question: Why go out on such a day, even in such bad weather, why have parades, why gather here in millions? In order to give symbolic expression to the fact that we are not city and country, not workmen, clerks, artisans, peasants, students, citizens, not just any adherents of any *Weltanschauung*, but that we are members of a people, that united we represent that which makes us as one in a common duty, so that we can work in this world with the forces which Almighty God has given us, each in his place, each where he stands and must stand. We know that many are irreplaceable, but all are indispensable; it makes no difference whether they come from the factory, from the counting house, from the construction office, from the shop, or from the farm; we are one people in a single great community and one in the fulfillment of a single great task. Thus we have gathered on this day, in order to document, in a symbolical way, the fact that we are more than a gathering of individual persons with divergent interests, that none of us is too proud, none of us too exalted, none too rich, and none too poor to stand together before the countenance of the Lord and the world in this indissoluble, solemn community.

We need this united nation. For when was a leadership ever confronted with a more difficult task than our German leadership? Consider, my *Volksgenossen*, what our Germany is, and compare it with other countries. What do we have? We have 137 persons per square kilometer, no colonies, no raw materials, no foreign exchange, no capital, no foreign securities any longer, only heavy burdens, sacrifices, taxes, and low wages. What have we, measured by the wealth of other states, by the wealth of other countries, by the riches of other peoples? What do we have? Only one thing! We have our people! Our people is either everything or nothing. On it alone can we rely. On it alone can we build. Everything that we have done until now we owe to the goodness of our people, to its efficiency, to its loyalty, to its decency, to its industry, to its sense of order. When I consider all this, then it seems to me to be more than anything that the rest of the world could offer us. And that, I believe, we can announce to other nations on this first of May. You need not fear that we want anything from you. We are proud enough to state that the most precious thing, which you could by no means give us, we have ourselves—our people. As *Fuehrer* I can think of no more glorious and no prouder task in

the world than to serve this people. One might give me continents and I should rather be the poorest citizen in this people. . . .

Therefore, I beseech you to renew on this day of this greatest and proudest demonstration in the world your confession of faith in your people, our community and our National Socialist State! My will—it must be the confessional of all of us—is your faith! My faith is to me—precisely as to you—everything in the world! The greatest thing that God has given me in this world is my people! My faith rests in it. I serve it with my will and I give it my life! (Berlin, May 1, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 2, 1935)

Proud Leader

This day [May 1] should show the world that our regime does not depend on bayonets, but that it rests in the hearts of the people, that it lives in the people, draws its strength from the people, that it acts in accord with the desires of the people and for this people. . . . How wonderful it is to have in Germany today a people that rules itself, regulates its own affairs, leads itself, instead of being ruled by force! How wonderful it is to have here a people that does not try to make life difficult and miserable for others, but that begins to be more and more considerate of one another. We are so happy to be able to live among this people, and I am proud to be permitted to be your leader! So proud that I cannot imagine anything in this world that I would rather be. I should a thousand times rather be the last *Volks-genosse* among you than to be a king anywhere else. I am particularly filled with this pride on this day. When I drove through the streets just now and saw those hundreds, thousands, and millions of *Volks-genossen* to the right and to the left of me, from all enterprises and workshops, from all factories and offices, my heart beat faster and I thought to myself: That is our Germany! That is our people, our glorious German people and our beloved German Reich. (Berlin, May 1, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 2, 1936)

*No Usurper**

The source of my strength is the German people. From the German people I have come, for this people I work, to this people I have

*This and the three following statements were made during the election campaign which was conducted after the reoccupation of the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland on March 7, 1936. The election was held on March 29.

pledged myself, and to this people I always return when important decisions are under consideration. I submit myself to its decision. The German people shall judge me; it shall decide whether I have represented its rights properly, whether I have served its will correctly, whether I have managed its affairs profitably.

I am no usurper. I have not usurped this office. By the election of the people I stand in this place, and by the will of the people I remain in this place. So now at the beginning of the fourth year of my leadership and the regime of the National Socialist Party, I again turn to the German people with the request that it render judgment. What I have done, I did according to my conscience, and to the best of my knowledge, filled with concern for my people, realizing the necessity of protecting its honor, in order to lead it again to a position of honor in this world. I have done this in the face of every difficulty and every danger. And should unnecessary sorrow or suffering ever come to my people because of my actions, then I beseech the Almighty God to punish me.

The German people shall now testify whether I have been industrious these three years, whether I have worked these three years or whether I have not worked. It shall decide whether Germany has become weaker in these three years, or whether she has become stronger, whether Germany has become richer or poorer. It shall decide whether the nation has sunk deeper or whether it has been resurrected. This is what the German people must now decide. It must also decide whether I have represented its interests to the rest of the world, or whether it has the same concept of honor regarding its life and existence as I. This decision I await, and I know it will be my greatest historical legitimation. Then I shall be able to go before the world and say: It is not I who speak—the German people have spoken. (Karlsruhe, March 12, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 14, 1936)

The Great Commoner

It is regrettable that the statesmen and also the peoples of the rest of the world are unable to have a look at contemporary Germany. If they could, I believe that they would then be delivered of the erroneous idea that this people languishes under a dictatorship which oppresses them. Secondly, they would be delivered of the error of believing that the world can do with this people as it pleases.

The German people will not give their vote on March 29th for my regime; for that purpose I would not need the election. I need

the German people in a struggle which I carry on for them, in a struggle for German equality, in a struggle against the arrogance of others who now again presume to treat the German people as a people of inferior status. I need the German people in order to declare with them before the whole world that no matter what may come, we will not yield one centimeter from our demands for equality! Not because we want a disturbance of European order, but because we are convinced that a permanent order in Europe is only thinkable under the supposition of equal nations. The idea that a European order could be permanently founded on the defamation of a people of 67,000,000 is unhistorical; it is madness and folly.

I want nothing else but that this German people shall grow into the European community as an equal number. I pity the statesmen who think that such cooperation can best be introduced through new defamation of the German nation. If they would look beyond the moment, beyond the supposed success of days, weeks, or months, then they would be shocked to recognize the necessary consequences of such unhistorical action. As *Fuehrer* of the German nation and as its responsible spokesman and director I am not in a position to take even so much as one step which would be incompatible with the honor of the German nation. I can act in this manner, for I know that the whole German nation stands behind me in this resolve. . . .

I have called this election so that everyone could see that it is not I alone who hold such concepts of honor, but that they belong to the entire nation. The world shall see that it is not I alone who make this offer of peace, but that I make it in the name of 67,000,000 people; and that it is not I alone who reject insulting demands, but that the entire German people will not stand for them. I also wish to show the world by this election that in Germany the people are not tyrannized by bayonets, but that the Government enjoys the confidence of the entire people. I have come from the people. For fifteen years I have slowly brought this Movement forward from the people. I have not been placed over this people by anyone. Out of the people I have grown, in the people I have remained, to the people I return. I see my ambition in the fact that I know of no statesman in the world who can say with greater right than I that he is the representative of a people. Today, my German people, I appeal to you to support me with your faith. Be now the source of my strength and my faith. (Hamburg, March 20, 1936; *Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 22, 1936)

Fuehrer and Volk

I will not sign any secret documents, and I will not conclude any secret alliances. I assure you, my *Volksgenossen*, that I will never pledge Germany to anything concerning which the German people are unaware. I shall not allow the General Staff to make military pacts with other nations concerning which the public knows nothing. I do not believe that there are advantages in such a procedure. When to-day I make the world an offer, then it is not I who make this offer, but it is the entire German people who make this offer through me. On the other hand, when I decline something, then the world can be just as convinced that it is the German people who decline it. (Ludwigshafen, March 25, 1936; *Frankfurter Zeitung*, March 27, 1936)

Voice of the People

I receive my strength from my people. First I struggled for fourteen years for the Movement in order to establish a community of the people in Germany upon which one could build further. For fourteen years I worked on this instrument. When I came to power I was just as strong as this my instrument. And since then I am only as strong as my people is strong, for the people is the source of my entire strength. I do not imagine that one individual alone can perform miracles in this world. The miracle lies in the power of a people, the power given by nature and willed by God. I will create this power! I will mobilize the best forces and the highest values of this people, so that this people itself stands firm and so that I am accordingly made strong again. The power of this people is my power and its strength is my strength. I serve no entrepreneur and no worker and no class; I belong exclusively to the German people.

Whatever I have undertaken, I have always undertaken with the conviction that it must be done for our people! Whenever I take up the cause of the German peasants I do so for the sake of the people. I have no manor and no estate. I take up the cause of my German peasants because I know that in them lies the foundation of German strength. Without them Germany will go to ruin.

I do not support the rearmament of the German people for the reason that I am a share-holder. I believe that I am perhaps the only statesman in the world who does not have a bank account. I hold no shares; I have no share in any kind of an enterprise; I draw no divi-

dends. What I want, however, is that my people should become strong so that they can endure in this world. That is my will! . . .

German people! Behold the greatness and the totality of the last three years! Be fair. Do you, if you are a decent German, have reason, before the German people, before history and before posterity, to be ashamed during the last three years? Do you not finally have reason to be proud again? Are you not able to say again: Lord God, whatever the situation may perhaps be here and there, for the most part we have once more become a respectable people! We have also become a very industrious and energetic people. . . . In these three years we have proved that we are a people which need not be ashamed before others. I do not subordinate myself to the world, for the world cannot judge me. I subject myself only to you, German people! You judge over me! Acknowledge whether you consider my work to be right, whether you believe that I have labored diligently, that I have expended myself for you in these years, that I employed my time properly in the service of this people. Give your vote now! If you vote affirmatively then you support me just as I have supported you.

I want no reward other than your approval! That in itself will make me strong again. I will then be able to stand before the rest of the world and say to anyone: I do not know whether or not you speak in the name of your peoples, but you cannot dispute the fact that I speak here in the name of my people! Do not expect that I will bring shame to the name of my people, that I will be weak, cowardly, and dishonest. Do not expect anything like that from me! I will fight for my people respectably and faithfully—at all times ready for peace and always resolved to uphold its rights and interests.

Thus I beg you, my *Volksgenossen*, you who are listening all over Germany at this hour, in all the factories and workshops, in all the offices and business places, let your hearts be lifted up! Be proud to be members of the community of such a people and announce this to all the world! On March 29th, the world must know: Here speaks not one man, but a people. (Essen, March 27, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 28, 1936)

One Will

On February 20th, before the Reichstag deputies I made for the first time a fundamental demand of an unqualified nature.* The

*Hitler has in mind his strong assertion that the principle of self-determination should be granted to the Germans in Central Europe.

whole nation heard me and understood me. A certain statesman [Schuschnigg] failed to understand. He has been dismissed and my promise of that time is fulfilled.

For the second time I spoke about this same demand before the Reich's party convention [Nuremberg, September 12]. Again the nation heard this demand. Today I come before you and for the first time I speak to the people itself as in the days of our great struggle. You know what that means! There must remain no vestige of doubt in the world today. It is not a *Fuehrer* or a man who speaks, but the whole German people. If I am now spokesman of this German people, I know that at this instant the millions of this nation agree word for word with my utterances, endorse them, and accept them as their own vows. Let other statesmen take inventory and see if that is also the case with them.

The question that has concerned us most deeply for the past months and weeks is well known. It is not so much a question of Czechoslovakia; it is a question of Mr. Benes! This name symbolizes everything that is agitating millions today, that either drives them to despair or fills them with fanatic determination. . . . Mr. Benes now pins his hopes on the rest of the world. Neither he nor his diplomats conceal this. They declare, "It is our hope that Chamberlain will fall, that Daladier will be removed, that upheavals will occur everywhere." They set their hopes on Soviet Russia. He still believes he can evade fulfillment of his duties. To that I can say only one thing. Two men face each other on this scene. There is Mr. Benes and here am I. We are two different individualities. While Mr. Benes slunk about the world during the great war, I fulfilled my duty as a decent German soldier. Today I face this man again as a soldier of my people. . . .

I have made an offer to Mr. Benes that is nothing else than a realization of what he himself has already conceded. He now holds the decision in his hand. Peace or war! Either he will now accept this offer and at last give the Germans their freedom, or we will take this freedom for ourselves! There is one thing the world must recognize. During the four and one-half years of the war and in the long years of my political life no one ever has been able to charge me with cowardice. I now stand at the head of my people as its first soldier and behind me—may the world know this—there now marches a people vastly different from that of 1918. At that time a roving scholar may have succeeded in infiltrating the poison of democratic slogans into our people, but the German people of today is no longer the German people of

1918. Such slogans affect us like wasp stings. We are immune to them.

In this hour the whole German people unites with me. It shall feel my will as its will, just as I regard its future and fate as a guide of my actions. And we will strengthen this common will as we did in the time of our struggle for power. At that time, when I went out as a simple unknown soldier to conquer a Reich, I never doubted that success and final victory would be mine. A band of brave men and brave women gathered around me then and they joined with me. Thus I ask you today, my German people, fall in behind me, man for man and woman for woman. In this hour let us make one holy common resolve. It will be stronger than any distress, any peril. For if this determination is stronger than distress and peril, it will conquer distress and peril. We are determined! Let Mr. Benes choose! (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 27, 1938)

First Soldier of the Reich

I will continue this struggle [World War II], regardless of whom it may be against, until the safety and rights of the Reich are assured. I have spent more than six years in building up the German armed forces. During this time more than ninety billions have been devoted to this purpose. Today they are the best equipped in the world and are incomparably superior to those of 1914. My confidence in them is unshakable. If I have now called upon these armed forces and if I am now demanding sacrifices from the German people, and if needs be every sacrifice, I am entitled to do so, for I am just as ready today as I was before to make every personal sacrifice. I ask nothing from any German man that I was not ready myself to do for more than four years. No privations shall be demanded from Germans which I am not prepared myself to undergo. From now on my whole life belongs to my people as never before. I desire nothing other than to be the first soldier of the German Reich.

In evidence of this I have again put on that old coat which was the most sacred and most dear to me of all. I will not take it off until the victory is ours or unless I shall not live to see the end of this conflict. . . . As a National Socialist and a German soldier I enter this struggle for my people and its resurrection and for Germany. This struggle was inspired by one single doctrine of faith—the belief in the German people. (Berlin, Sept. 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 2, 1939)

Guardian of the Future

I do not desire war, but when it is forced upon me I will wage it as long as I have breath in my body. I can wage it today, because I know that the whole German nation is behind me. I am the guardian of its future and I act accordingly. I could have made my own life much easier. I have been fighting for twenty years, and I have assumed the burden of all these anxieties and of this never-ceasing work, convinced that it must be done for the German people. My own life and my own health are of no importance. I know that, above all, the German Army, every man and every officer of it, supports me in the same spirit. All those fools who imagined that there could ever be any disruption here have forgotten that the Third Reich is not the same as the Second. The German people stands behind me to a man. At this point I thank, above all, the German workman and the German peasant. They made it possible for me to prepare for this struggle and to create, as far as armaments were concerned, the necessary conditions for resistance. They also provide me with the possibility of continuing the war, however long it may last.

I also give special thanks to the women of Germany—to those numberless women, who must now perform part of the heavy work of men, who have adapted themselves to their war duties with devotion and fanaticism and who are replacing men in so many positions. I thank you all—you who are making this personal sacrifice, who are bearing the many restrictions that are necessary. I thank you in the name of all those who represent the German people today and who will be the German people of the future.

This struggle is not a struggle for the present but primarily a struggle for the future. I stated on September 3, 1939, that time would not conquer us, that no economic difficulties would bring us to our knees, and that we could still less be defeated by force of arms. The morale of the German people guarantees this. The German people will be richly rewarded in the future for all that they are doing. When we have won this war it will not have been won by a few industrialists or millionaires, or by a few capitalists or aristocrats, or by a few bourgeois or by anyone else.

Workers, you must look upon me as your guarantor. I was born a son of the people; I have spent all my life struggling for the German people, and when this hardest struggle of my life is over there will be new tasks for the German people. We have already projected great plans. All of our plans have but one aim: To develop still

further the great German State, to make that great German nation more and more conscious of its existence and, at the same time, to give it everything which makes life worth living. We have decided to break down to an ever-increasing degree the barriers preventing individuals from developing their faculties and from attaining their just due. We are firmly determined to build up a social state which must and shall be a model of perfection in every sphere of life. . . .

Should anyone say to me: These are mere fantastic dreams, mere visions, I can only reply that when I set out on my course in 1919 as an unknown, nameless soldier I built my hopes of the future upon a most vivid imagination. Yet all has come true. What I am planning or aiming at today is nothing compared to what I have already accomplished and achieved. It will be achieved sooner and more definitely than everything already achieved. The road from an unknown and nameless person to *Fuehrer* of the German nation was harder than will be the way from *Fuehrer* of the German nation to creator of the coming peace. I had to fight and struggle for fifteen years for your confidence. Today, thanks to your confidence, I fight and struggle for Germany. Some day we shall once more struggle together in confidence for this great Reich of peace, work, prosperity, and culture which we intend to establish and will establish. (Berlin, Dec. 10, 1940; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 11, 1940)

Rooted in the People

What distinguishes the present from what went before [first World War] is simply this: Then the people were not behind the Kaiser, while behind me stands one of the most marvelous organizations ever built up on this earth, and this organization represents the German people. Further, the present time is different from then in that at the head of this people stands one who in critical times would not go abroad but one who has never known anything but struggle and has always known one watchword—strike, strike, and strike again.

Something else distinguishes the Germany of today from the Germany of those days. Then the leaders had no roots in the people, for when all is said and done it was a class state. Today we are in the midst of the completion of what grew out of that war. For when I returned from the war I brought back home with me my experiences at the front; out of them I built up my National Socialist community of the people at home. Today the National Socialist community of the people takes its place at the front, and you will notice from many

things how these armed forces from month to month become more National Socialist, how they increasingly bear the stamp of the New Germany, how all privileges, classes, prejudices, and so on are more and more removed; how from month to month the German national community gains ground. At the end of this war the German national community perhaps will have stood its hardest trial.

All this differentiates the present Germany from that of the past. And this we owe on the one hand to the immeasurable heroism at the front, the heroism of millions of iron soldiers, known and unknown, of tens of thousands of gallant officers who today feel more and more one with their men. Some of them have risen from the ranks, for we have removed all obstacles. Just as within the Party everyone can attain any position if he is capable, so any position in the state, even the highest, has been open to even the poorest member of our nation since this Party has been at the helm. It is the same in the armed forces, not in theory or as an exception in rare individual cases, but in practice. We are building up a war army, in the middle of the war, such as the world has never seen before. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1941; B.B.C.)

8

Future Fuehrers

No people can maintain itself if it does not have a percentage of heroes, and no state can exist if its leaders are not heroic.

Berlin, Nov. 17, 1928

When I think of that healthy youth which belongs to our nation, my faith in the future becomes a joyful certainty.

Berlin, Jan. 30, 1937

No one has more thoroughly appreciated the tremendous value of enlisting Germany's "lost generation" than the Fuehrer. He spoke realistically at Elbing on November 6, 1933: "When an opponent declares, 'I still will not come over to your side and you will not get me on your side,' I calmly say, 'Your child belongs to us already. A people lives forever. What are you? You will pass on. Your descendants, however, now stand in the new camp. In a short time they will know nothing else but this new community'."

By regimenting the youth of Germany, Hitler has endeavored to insure the preservation and continued supremacy of National Socialism. To this end he has subjected German youth to an intense program of Nazification.

The young German is taught iron discipline, fanatical loyalty, blind obedience, fierce national pride. He is trained in the cult of the heroic. He is made to believe in German destiny, racial Aryanism, and élite consciousness. He is led to admire the authoritarian state and to despise democracy and the qualities encouraged by the democratic way of life. Again and again, he is told that the individual is nothing, that the state is everything, and the service to Fuehrer and Fatherland is a sacred, privileged honor.

Vigorous and healthy youth is universally desired, but the Nazis have not been interested in physical well-being for its own sake. Their mobilization of German youth has had one primary objective: preparation for the supreme test of war.

A whole generation of Germans has been reared in the fanatical spirit of National Socialism. This poses a grave problem for the future, for it is this Nazified generation with which the Allies must deal in the post-war world. To suppose that there will be many anti-Nazis among them, anxious to throw off Hitler's yoke, and to embrace a democratic order, is pure illusion. The Fuehrer's regimentation has been too intensive and too thorough for that.

Germany's Future

As I come to the end of my speech, I have one request to make of those of you who are young. There is a very special reason for this. The other parties train their youth in the gift of gab, but we prefer to train them physically. For I tell you: The youth who does not find his way to the place where, in the final analysis, the fate of his people is being looked after in the best sense, the youth who does nothing but study philosophy, who keeps his nose in his books, or sits at home behind the stove, is no German youth.

I appeal to you to join our Storm Troops. And no matter how many insults or how much slander you may hear as a result, you all know that these Storm Troops exist for our protection, for your protection, and therewith not only for the protection of the Movement, but for the protection of a future Germany. If you are slandered and reviled, all hail to you boys, you have the good fortune to be hated already at the age of eighteen and nineteen years by the world's greatest rascals. What others learn only after long years of hard struggle—this highest gift of distinguishing between the honest man and the bandit—falls as a stroke of fortune into your laps while you are still young. You can be certain that the more they slander you, the more we will respect you. We know that not one of us would be making speeches anymore if it were not for you. We know and see that our Movement would be trampled in the dirt if you had not protected it. You are today the defense of a Movement which is called to revolutionize Germany someday from the bottom up, in order that there may come to pass what so many were perhaps longing for on November 9, 1918: A German Reich, a Germanic State, and as far as it lies within us, a German Republic.

I ask you therefore not to get discouraged. Every fight must be fought to the end. It is better that the fight come early than late. He who at the outset enters the fight with the most confidence always fares the best. We can well carry this highest confidence in our hearts. For he who today is leader of the German people on our side, so help me, has nothing to gain, but perhaps everything to lose. They have one great assurance. He who fights for our side today cannot hope to win great laurels or, still less, great material goods; it is more likely that he will land in jail.

Today only an idealist can be your leader, because he has to lead those against whom everything seems to be conspiring. In that very fact, however, there lies an immeasurable source of strength. The con-

viction that our Movement cannot be kept alive by a love of money and gold, but only by a love for our people, should always again strengthen and encourage us for the fight. And finally, take with you one assurance: If this fight were not to come, Germany would never have peace. Germany would waste away and at best would finally perish like a decaying corpse. We were not, however, destined for that. We do not believe in the downfall of our people. We believe, rather, that the misfortune which the Lord has visited upon us today is the scourge which is to spur us on and must spur us on to new greatness, to new power and glory, to a Germany that is to be for the first time what millions of our best people have inwardly been hoping for through the ages, namely, the Germany of the German people. (Munich, July 28, 1922; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Aug. 16, 1922)

A Sacred Duty

You youth organizations have a sacred duty. You have been called upon to help in the resurrection of our country. It is your task to help out and to fight along, and if necessary to give your life for our cause. It is a worthy goal that we have set for ourselves; it almost seems unattainable. But it is attainable, if you do away with everything that interferes, and feel yourselves united only by bonds of blood, and do everything to build a Germanic Germany, which will of itself bring forth a constitution.

The Marxists taught: If you will not be my brother, I will bash your skull in. Our motto shall be: If you will not be a German, I will bash your skull in. For we are convinced that our Movement cannot succeed without a struggle. We have to fight with ideas, but if necessary also with our fists. I remind you of the 2,000,000 dead on the fields of battle. They are asking of you an infinitely smaller sacrifice than they made themselves. Our enemies realize that the future of our people depends on you. Young Germany—that is what you are. And that is why they hate you. Be proud that they hate you, obstinately proud. Hail to you! (Munich, Nov., 1922; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 22, 1922)

A New Fighting Type

A people draws its strength from the manifold roots of its race. . . . The leadership of a nation will be recognized as long as its ability is equal to its demands. For the one carries within itself the proof of the other. Every government has the political task of making use of

the abilities at work in the nation. . . . The people lives with a longing for real leadership; it will recognize the true leader with unerring instinct. If the Germans wish to overcome their present misery, they must make a new choice of leaders according to the law of proved achievement. Just as the magnet of pacifism with irresistible force draws unto itself those who are cowardly, so our magnet of courage, sacrifice and devotion to the nation will win over those who are worthy. The regeneration of the whole people is one of the first and most important tasks of National Socialism. A new group of leaders of achievement must replace the incapable bourgeois leaders. . . .

The continuous recruiting of the political leader and the fighting type of National Socialism will later be effected only through the youth organization of the Movement. The primary task of the Youth Movement is to work out a systematic selection of those who by their merit are ready for political leadership. The Hitler Youth is the forerunner of the Storm Troopers (*Sturmabteilung*). Through the Hitler Youth, the million [Storm Troopers] of today will be supplemented by a new million of ironlike fiber. The political task of the Hitler Youth, which has grown into the world of National Socialist ideology is to win over all the heroic people of our nation. In this connection we National Socialists accept the law of the old army, according to which every soldier carried a marshal's baton in his knapsack.

These are the roads which lead to power and to the ultimate goals. Let us never give up the will to power; otherwise Germany stands at the end of her history and another people will take her place. If we succeed in creating the new political fighting type—and I confidently believe that we will—then the world will live to see a nation, the tremendous strength of which will be unconquerable. (Munich, Nov. 18, 1931; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 19, 1931)

Flesh of Our Flesh, Blood of Our Blood

After a year I am able to greet you here [in Nuremberg] again. Tremendous things have taken place in Germany in the meantime. Twelve months ago the struggle for power was awarded with success, and since then our Movement, of which you are the young guard and of which you will one day be the bearers, has taken possession of one position in this state after another, and it has therewith given them back to the people. You yourselves have grown since then from an organization which was already large at that time into a greater Youth Movement, into the greatest youth organization in the world. That is

the merit of numerous workers, at whose head is the leader appointed by me—party comrade von Schirach.

You here in this large stadium are but a fragment of what today is in all of Germany. You in your youth must now take up and learn that which we wish to see someday in all of Germany. We know that there is no philanthropy in international affairs. Everything must be fought for and conquered.

A person will not be able to command that which he has not learned previously, and that for which he has not trained himself. We now desire that you, boys and girls, should learn what we someday expect from Germany and what we would like to see in Germany. We want to be a people, and you, our youth, are to become this people. We want someday to see no more of class distinctions, and you already have to keep class prejudice from growing up among you. We want someday to see a Reich, and you have to train yourselves for it now in your organization. We want this people to be faithful, and you must learn fidelity. We want this people to be obedient, and you must practice obedience. We want this people to be peace-loving but also courageous, and you must therefore be peace-loving and at the same time courageous. We do not want this people to grow soft, but we want it to be hard so that it will be able to withstand the hardships of life. And for this you have to harden yourselves in your youth. You must learn to be hard, to stand privations without breaking down. We want this people to love honor and you already in the days of your youth must live up to this concept of honor. But we also want that someday you will again become a proud people, and in your youth you must live in true pride, pride in being the youth of a proud people, so that someday your youthful pride will become the pride of the generation.

Everything that we ask of the Germany of the future, that, boys and girls, we also ask of you. This is what you must practice, and this is what you must give to the future. For, no matter what we do today and what we achieve, we will pass on. But in you Germany will continue to live, and when nothing more is left of us, then you must hold in your fists the flag which we once raised out of the mire. You must, therefore, stand firm on your own soil; you must be hard, so that the flag will never drop from your grasp—and then generation after generation may follow you and you can equally demand from them that they become what you have been. Then Germany will look upon you with pride and all hearts will overflow with joy when we look at you and see that you are the proof that our work has not been in vain but that it will be beneficial for our whole people. Then we will

all experience that proud happiness of seeing in you the fulfilment of our work and the realization that the millions of the Great War and the numerous comrades among us did not give their lives in vain for Germany, and that in the end there rises up again a unified, free, proud, honor loving people.

I know that it cannot be otherwise, for you are flesh of our flesh, and blood of our blood, and in your minds there burns the same spirit that activates us. You cannot but be bound to us, and when the great ranks of our Movement today march victoriously through Germany, then I know that you will join us, and we all know: Before us lies Germany, in us marches Germany, and behind us comes Germany. (Nuremberg, Sept. 8, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 9, 1934)

Obedience Ueber Alles

German Youth! For the third time you have answered this call, you who are more than 50,000 representatives of a community that is growing from year to year. The importance of that community which you embody here each year becomes increasingly greater. Not only in numbers, no; we see it, but also in quality. When I think back on the first call, and on the second one, and compare them with that of today, then I see the same development that we now notice in all phases of German life. Our people becomes noticeably more disciplined, more upright and stronger, and our youth is setting the pace. The ideal of manhood even among our people has not always been the same. There were times—and they seem far away and we can hardly understand them—when the fellow who could hold his liquor was the ideal of the young German. Today we are happy to see the youth resistant to any hardship of the weather, the hardy youth, in place of the fellow who knows how to drink. For it does not only depend on how many glasses of beer he can drink, but on how much he can endure; not on how many nights in a row he can gallivant, but on how many kilometers he can march. Today we no longer see the ideal of the German people in the beer drinker of former days, but in men and women who are healthy to the core, who are sturdy.

The things we want from our youth are different from what was wanted in the past. In our eyes the German youth of the future should be slim and lithe, fast as greyhounds, tough as leather, and hard as Krupp steel. We must bring up a new type of man, so that our people will not succumb to the symptoms of degeneracy of the times.

We do not talk, we act. We undertook to give this people a new

type of education, an education that is to begin with our youth and will never end. In the future our young men will pass from one school into the other. It starts with the child and ends with the old fighter of the Movement. No one shall say that there is any time when he can be left entirely to his own devices. It is the duty of everyone to serve his people. Everyone has the duty to prepare himself for this service, to harden himself physically and to prepare and strengthen himself spiritually. The earlier this preparation begins, the better. In the future we will not permit ten or fifteen years to go by in German education and then be forced to make up what unfortunately has previously been spoiled. It is our intent and unshakable determination to instill already into the hearts of youth the spirit which we regard as the only one possible in this great Germany, the spirit which we want to see perpetuated in the future. . . .

The time will come when the German people will look with real joy upon its youth; then all of us will peacefully and confidently spend our old age in the firm and happy conviction, in the happy knowledge that our struggle was not in vain. Behind us someone is already following in our footsteps, someone with our spirit, our determination, our hardiness, the representatives of the life of our race.

We will harden ourselves to such an extent that any storm will find us strong. We will never forget that the sum total of all virtues and all strength can be effective only when it is subservient to one will and to one command. We are standing here now not by mere chance, not because each one of you did as he pleased, but because you were called here by the order of your youth leader, and because that order became a thousand separate orders. And as each of these orders was obeyed, millions of German boys in Germany became one organization; and out of tens of thousands of comrades living in Germany came this demonstration, this present roll call. Nothing is possible unless one will commands, a will which has to be obeyed by others, beginning at the top and ending only at the very bottom. Beside physical training and education, this is our second great task.

We are a following (*Gefolgschaft*) but as the word itself indicates, following means to follow, it means to be a loyal member of a following. We must train our people so that whenever someone has been appointed to command, the others will recognize it as their duty to obey him, for it can happen that an hour later they will be called upon to command, and they can do it then only if others in turn obey. This is the expression of an authoritarian state—not of a weak, babbling democracy—of an authoritarian state where everyone is proud to

obey, because he knows: I will likewise be obeyed when I must take command. Germany is no chicken house where everyone runs about at random, cackling and crowing, but we are a people that from its infancy on learns how to be disciplined. If others do not understand us, that is all the same to us. . . . We did not sit back with our hands in our laps and say: It is not given to us to solve the problem, there is nothing we can do about it. No. Something could be done about it, and we did it. You, my boys and girls, are the living proof of the success of this work. You are the proof that this idea has come to life in the German Reich. You are the proof of how this idea has become reality. Believe me, the day will come when German youth will once again have a wonderful healthy and glowing appearance, healthy, frank, sincere, brave, and peace loving. We are no ruffians. If the rest of the world misunderstands us in our discipline, that is not our fault. From this discipline fewer quarrels will develop for the world than from the parliamentary-democratic confusion of the present day. We go our own way and we do not wish to cross the path of anyone else. Let the others leave our course undisturbed. The only requirement we have to set up for our love of peace is to harm no one and to tolerate no harm to us.

If we plan and define the way of life for the German people in this fashion, then eventually I believe there will develop among other nations an understanding for such a decent attitude and that perhaps here and there out of this understanding a few will extend to us the hand of brotherhood. But we must never forget that only the strong deserve friendship and only the strong grant friendship. We want, therefore, to make ourselves strong—that is our motto. You are responsible to me for making this come true. You are the future of the nation, the future of the German Reich. (Nuremberg, Sept. 14, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 15, 1935)

In the Sign of the Swastika

That which we are today we have become through the perseverance of our own will. Providence repays the strong, the courageous, the brave, the industrious, the orderly, and the disciplined individual for his sacrifice. . . . In you a new youth has arisen, filled with ideals different from those that filled the young people of my day, filled with a more sacred faith than the generation before us. A new youth has come forth with different conceptions of the beauty of youth, of the strength of youth. I can still see before my eyes the youth of the

past. They thought themselves strong in that they led a life of enjoyment. They thought they were showing their patriotism by using empty phrases; it was a type of youth where the young man believed that he was a model for his people by virtue of the great amount of alcohol he could hold. No, my young friends, a more magnificent generation is growing up today. You present a more beautiful picture than the one the past offered us—yes, taught us. A new standard for beauty has been created. No longer is it the fat beer-drinking philistine who is the ideal of our time, but the slim, lithe boy, who stands firmly on the ground, legs parted, healthy in his body and also healthy in his soul. In the same manner the German girl is growing up beside you boys. Perhaps that is the greatest miracle of our time. Buildings are erected; factories are founded; streets are laid out; railway stations constructed; but above all, a new German individual is growing up.

When I look at you, filled with deepest emotion, when I meet your eye, then I know that my life's struggle was not fought in vain, that the work has not been in vain! It will live on in this flag and in its bearers, and a worthy generation will someday stand ready to take your place. You will be men like the great generation of the war. You will be courageous and brave as were your older brothers and fathers. You will be as loyal as Germans have ever been. You will see your country in a completely different light from what we once unfortunately had to see it. You will know a different devotion to the eternal Reich and the eternal people.

Five years have passed since your leader, my good party comrade Schirach, who himself came from among you, took over your education and training. What was then a weak and small beginning is today a remarkable achievement. That should be an admonition and a comfort to us for the future. If we were able to accomplish this marvel in five years, then the next five, ten, twenty, one hundred years will truly strengthen it. Generation will replace generation in tackling and solving these problems, and always a new youth will come together here in this city. It will always grow stronger, always more powerful and always healthier and it will always give the living generations an ever greater hope for the future. Let us unite our best wishes for this future; may this future bring our people happiness and success; may it let our people live, and destroy all those who try to interfere with this life.

We live today in a quickened age, but we do not complain. We are used to struggle, for we have come forth out of struggle. We will

place our feet firmly on our ground, and we will not fall before any attack. You will stand beside me, if this hour should ever come. You will stand before me, at my side, and behind me, and you will hold our flags high. Then let our old enemy try to attack us and to rise up again. Let him carry his Soviet symbol before him—we will conquer again in the sign of the Swastika. (Nuremberg, Sept. 12, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 13, 1936)

Tenets for the Teen-Aged

National unity which cost us blood and sacrifice in the course of this century probably means more to us than to other peoples who achieved their unity more easily. We are going to hold on to this unity for all time to come, and the German boys and girls are the guarantors that this shall be so. That is why we have made it our task to inoculate our youth at any early age with the spirit of this community of the people, at an age when human beings have not as yet been spoiled by any kind of education. There is only one German people and, therefore, there can be only one German youth! There can be only one German Youth Movement, because there is only one education of youth and only one youth training program. . . . This Reich stands and it builds further upon its youth. This new Reich will give its youth to no one, but it will take youth and educate and train it itself. We want a youth healthy in mind and healthy in body, a youth whose health is apparent from its very appearance. We want a proud youth—not a youth that slinks through the countryside with bowed heads, but a youth proud of the privilege to be the sons and daughters of our people. We want a manly youth and womanly girls, a courageous youth, not a youth accomplished in the art of drinking, but a youth that can give a beating and take a beating, a youth, therefore, that has been trained at an early age to endure hardships and privations. Furthermore, we want to educate this youth to be straightforward, without any kind of trickery or perfidy. It shall learn to stand and to walk erect, and to look everyone squarely in the eye. With this in mind, our youth should foster the highest comradeship at an early age, practice loyalty, and learn to obey. There is not only pride in giving commands, but there is also pride in being called upon to obey, pride in having the good fortune of standing back of a man. Virile and healthy peoples will regard this type of obedience as something self-understood. It is nothing more than our old Germanic idea of loyalty to the following (*Gefolgschaft*-

streue) which bound the men to their leader even to their last breath. This youth will be stronger than the youth of the past, for from childhood on it learned only to obey, to be loyal, decent, straightforward, courageous, brave, determined, but also to be young. And therefore, just as you, my boys and girls, love this our Germany, Germany must love you too. For you are for us by far the greatest treasure there is. (Berlin, May 1, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 2, 1937)

A Dream Come True

It is a good thing that the sun is not shining on you today as you are standing here. For we want to rear in you a generation not only for sunny days but for days of storm. I would regard all education given by National Socialism as useless if the result of this education were not a nation that could survive anything, even the most difficult days. In the future, my young people, you will be this nation. That which you do not learn today you will not be able to achieve in the future. Our conception of the ideals of youth is different from that ideal which existed in former days. There was a time—you know nothing about that—when boys of eighteen and twenty years of age were different from what they are today. The girls were also reared differently from the way they are now. That has changed. Instead of young people reared for the enjoyment of life, we find today that youth is brought up to bear privations and sacrifice, but above all to develop a strong, resistant body, for it is our belief that without such a body, a healthy spirit cannot in the long run pervade the nation. . . .

We want to fight on day in and day out for one goal and to ask Providence to keep our people healthy and true, to give our people an understanding of real freedom, and to keep alive the spirit of honor. We do not ask Providence to free us or to present freedom to us as a gift, but only that Providence permit us to be upright, so that we ourselves will be able at all times to fight for that place in the world which a free people needs. We do not want a gift, we want only the grace to be permitted to participate in an honest struggle. Then Providence may decide whether or not our people deserves this life.

You have become the youth of the German State. Never will the leadership of this youth be any other than that which has grown out of the National Socialist idea and the National Socialist Movement. Already today you are an integral part of this idea and this Move-

ment. The Movement has formed you, it has given you your uniform, and you will serve it all the rest of your life. It is a wonderful thing that in you the educational chain of our people has been completed. The chain begins with you, and it will end only when the last German sinks into the grave. Never in German history has there been such an inner unity in spirit, such determination and such leadership. Many generations before us longed for this. We have become the happy witnesses of its realization.

In you, my boys and girls, I see the most beautiful fulfillment of this age-old dream. Just as you today are standing before me, some-day centuries from now, year after year, the younger generation will be standing before the leader of the day. And they will again swear loyalty to the Germany that we, today, have fought for and won. Germany, *Sieg Heil!* (Nuremberg, Sept. 11, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 12, 1937)

Youth in Uniform

Before the National Socialist assumption of power, German youth was split up into numerous organizations. Today throughout the entire Reich there is only one youth organization, the Hitler Youth and League of German Girls, comprising in 1937 over 7,000,000 members, 59 regional and higher regional leaders, 1,365 district and girl leaders, and 8,000 sub-district girl leaders; 550,500 subordinate leaders of both sexes serve this greatest of modern youth movements.

The number of participants in the Reich Apprentice Competition was:

1934	500,000 boys and girls
1935	750,000 " " "
1936	1,036,000 " " "
1937	1,800,000 " " "

A similar picture is presented by the Reich Sport Competition :

1932	1,600,000 participants
1934	2,500,000 "
1935	3,700,000 "
1936	5,800,000 "
1937	6,100,000 "

The Naval Hitler Youth comprises 45,000 boys, the Motor Hitler Youth 60,000 boys. As part of the campaign for the encouragement of aviation 55,000 members of the *Jungvolk* were trained in gliding for group activities; 74,000 boys of the Hitler Youth are organized

in its flying units; 15,000 boys passed their gliding test in the year 1937 alone.

Today 1,200,000 boys of the Hitler Youth receive regular instruction in small-bore rifle shooting from 7,000 instructors. At present for the Hitler Youth alone, 1,400 homes and a large number of schools are under construction. The Youth Hostels Organization has 2,000 hostels at its disposal; in 1937 some 8,000,000 spent a night in the hostels, this figure being over eight times as large as that for all the other youth hostels in the world together.

In the interests of the health of these boys and girls, 4,000 doctors are engaged in the Hitler Youth, 800 dentists and some 500 chemists who are assisted by 40,000 ambulance boys and 35,000 first-aid girls. Over 30,000 doctors nominated by the Public Health Department look after the health of the individual boys and girls. The whole German youth is medically examined once a year. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

Qualities of Leadership

We are faced with further enormous and stupendous tasks. A new reserve of leaders must be formed within our people. Its composition is dependent upon race. It is, however, just as necessary to demand and make sure through the system and method of our education that above all bravery and readiness to accept responsibility should be regarded as essential qualities in those about to assume public office of any kind. When appointing men to leading positions in the state and Party, greater value should be placed on character than on purely academic or allegedly intellectual suitability. It is not abstract knowledge which must be considered a decisive factor wherever a leader is required but rather a natural talent for leadership and with it a highly developed sense of responsibility which brings with it determination, courage and endurance.

It must be recognized on principle that the lack of a sense of responsibility can never be made up for by a supposedly first-class academic training of which certificates may supply the proof. Knowledge and the qualities of leadership, which always imply energy, are not incompatible. But in doubtful cases knowledge can in no circumstances be a substitute for integrity, courage, bravery and determination. These are the qualities that are more important in a leader of the people in state and Party. I say this to you now, gentlemen, look-

ing back on the one year of German history which has shown me more clearly than the whole of my previous life how vital and essential these very qualities are, and how in a time of crisis one single energetic man of action outweighs a thousand feeble intellectuals. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Responsible Leaders of the Future

The fact that you today, my German Youth, are part of a strong and respected people, is the result solely of our work on the domestic front. When the National Socialist Party was founded twenty years ago, the new flag of the future Germany was hoisted already then. And after not quite fifteen years of struggle, this symbol became the flag of the German State. Since then, Germany's resurrection is inseparably connected with this new symbol.

You, German boys and girls, will someday be called upon to protect this flag. You will be able to carry and protect it with dignity and success only if you will be, without exception, as loyal to this flag as is the National Socialist Movement and through it the German people today. For you that will, of course, be much easier. We had to fight for this flag in hard and bitter struggle. It has been given to you, and you grew up under it. Already in your youth you wear it on your sleeve. Follow your flag; I rely on you. You will never forget what made Germany great. You have seen in your youth one of the rarest of historic events. Many of you probably cannot realize it, but the more mature among you lived it and felt it ardently. I know that your young hearts beat strongly and with feeling when I formed the Greater German Reich, when I again took advantage of its age-old historic right. In view of the greatness of the times you will fulfill the tasks put before us and especially those tasks which will be put before you.

Someday in the future the German nation will represent the power which has its beginning in its youth. We will never be more than that which we ourselves are, and we will never become more than what our youth is.

I expect that you will someday become upright, hardened German men and reliable women—hardened men, who know from the beginning on that one does not get anything for nothing, but that one has to fight for everything in this world; that one keeps only what one is ready at all times to defend.

You will never accept those deceptive phrases by which another

world believed that it could poison other peoples and thus destroy and annihilate them.*

In your youth you will learn to care for the body as well as the mind. You must be healthy and must refrain from anything that will poison your bodies. In the future the German will be measured only by the works of his intellect and the strength of his health. Above all, however, we want to see in you a youth that walks arm in arm, a youth that represents a firm indissoluble community.

Germany lived for centuries in the greatest disunity and weakness. That time has come to an end, thanks to the inner rebirth of our people. This disunity and weakness will end completely and decisively with you. It is necessary therefore that you realize this in your youth. There are nations about us who do not want us to be united. They do not want to grant us those rights which without question are given to all peoples. We, and other young peoples, have to regain with great effort the rights necessary for our existence, the rights which our forbears gave up at one time, and for which we may some day have to fight. And that is where, German Youth, I rely on you most of all.

Above all I expect that, if the time should come when the other world [the democracies] believes that it can attack German freedom, a cry millions strong will rise up from this youth; a cry so unanimous and so powerful, that everybody will realize that the days when one could count on disunion within Germany are definitely past and that the hard schooling of National Socialist training has at last succeeded in moulding the German people.

In doing this we are obeying one of the commands of the Almighty, who gave us our common blood and our common language. In living up to his command, Germany during the past six years has become great and respected again—even though perhaps less liked. We Germans, however, will be satisfied with the mutual love of our own *Volksgenossen*. I am satisfied since I know that you, my *Volksgenossen*, and above all you, my youth, are standing by me and that I am in your hearts just as my heart belongs to you.

Let the other world then threaten and menace. It will fail against that force which has always caused it to run aground, namely against the force of German unity. You are responsible for the preservation of this unity in the future, just as the present great generation is

*The reference here is to the so-called "false promises" of the Allies in 1918.

responsible for its existence today. In the same way that you have reason today to look with pride on the men who created the present Germany, so we want to be able to look into the future with confidence when we see you. I ended the era in which the youth of the present generation had to feel ashamed. You can be proud of the men who lead Germany today. And I want to be equally proud of you, Germany's future. Thus today, on the day which was once the day of German disunion and which now is the day of the German community, we unite in a profession of faith in our people and in our age-old great German Reich. Our people and Greater Germany—*Sieg Heil!* (Berlin, May 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 2, 1939)

9

Culture Politics

**Blood and race will once more become the source
of artistic intuition.**

Berlin, March 23, 1933

**Not only the direction of the political development,
but also the direction of the cultural development of
the Third Reich is determined by those who created it.**

Numerberg, Sept. 6, 1934

Hitler's statements on culture deny the elementary prerequisites of all true art. Freedom of purpose, freedom of expression, unlimited scope of subject and conception—these are rigidly proscribed along nationalist lines.

The Fuehrer's regimentation of all artistic expression exemplifies the degree to which the totalitarian state encompasses the life of a people. In forcing artists to hew to the Nazi line, Hitler has made one inexorable demand: strict conformity to the national ideal. Any artist daring to believe in the universality of culture has been stigmatized as a dangerous heretic. This accords with the Fuehrer's condemnation of internationalism in every form and also reflects his grim fear of the mind of man as it strives toward free inquiry.

Every Nazi artist is a servant of the state. As such he does not produce for a responsive public but for a party machine that scrutinizes his work in terms of political probity. He must extol the Fuehrer, glorify the Reich, add light and luster to Nazism and its leaders. Germany must be painted in rapturous colors; there must be no starkness, tragedy, ugliness.

With the Nazis, art is not an expression of taste—it is an expression of policy. The be-all and end-all of their program of cultural regimentation is to fulfill Hitler's dictum: "Art is politics."

Something in the composition and pseudo-subtleties of the material in this chapter leads one to suspect that the words are not Hitler's. Consummate bluntness and semi-hysterical blastings—the usual characteristics of the Fuehrer's prose—are here tempered by a sophistication and depth of philosophy that seem out of place. And there is the kind of delving into the realm of the intellect that is scarcely the habit of Hitler as thinker.

Whoever the author, these cultural theories are riddled with nebulous half-truths. Nor is there a lack of contradictions and inconsistencies, false precepts and premises.

The Symbol of Greatness

Art has been in all ages the expression . . . of a political will for power. Do you believe that the Babylonian and Egyptian monuments were created to attract tourists? Do you believe that ancient culture was created so that tourists would come and rest to the tunes of jazz after climbing the Cheops Pyramid? What we see in Rome and Athens did not grow out of ideas of the Bavarian tourist trade. Political development alone gave the greatest stimulus to works of art which even after 2,000 years we still admire. The Acropolis was the visible expression of power and the expression of the pride of the Greeks. Caesar wanted to create a capital and engrave its power in stone and metal. Our cathedrals were not built for the sake of tourists; it was a religious sentiment that caused people to work for centuries on a gigantic task.

The richness of the appearance of a city in the Middle Ages depended on the political significance of the city, not only on its economic prosperity. . . . All major enlargements of the city of Paris were dictated by political considerations. Paris was to become the center of the French province, toward which the ordinary Frenchman would look as an ideal of unsurpassable beauty. The French Empire was thereby supposed to be glorified and strengthened. The Republic took up those ideas and continued them. The same was true of Vienna. In the construction of the *Ringstrasse* a great and outstanding focal point of central power was established which opposed the disintegrating influences of the mixture of peoples. Frederick the Great attempted, by means of great building activity, to secure for himself the position which was necessary in order to represent the political power of the state in the field of foreign affairs. We also see the same thing in the smaller state capitals [of Germany]. Tourist bureaus would not have accomplished that. In Vienna, Karl Lueger* tried to immortalize the domination of his movement by great works of art so that the stones would talk when words were no longer spoken. Everywhere on the monuments it is written: Built by Dr. Karl Lueger. In Italy, Fascism draws incredible strength from the people. On its buildings it does not read: "Built for the tourist trade," but "Built in the third year of the Fascist regime in Italy."

Never has a great work of art been created for the sake of money. The artists have often starved to death beside their works. Every

*Karl Lueger (1844-1910), Austrian administrator and burgomaster of Vienna. He planned to make Vienna one of the most beautiful of cities.

epoch has also the artists it deserves. A miserable and characterless period in which money rules has no art but only trash and regards art as a means of attracting tourists. With this trash one can do business for awhile, but one cannot create lasting values. Munich would not have tourist trade if it had not had a Ludwig I** who made of Munich a city which everyone must see who wants to know Germany. Ludwig II† created works of art out of an inner urge, and not because he could realize a profit from them. . . .

We will see to it that the great tradition of this city will again be revived; we will proceed into the future with a great program for this city. Our program will not be the production of theater festivals, but the creation here for the first time again of a home for German art, not for an internationally tramping theater Jew but for real German art. We National Socialists believe that in times of political breakdown it is particularly necessary to discover new sources of strength and to set them flowing once again. After the political collapse of 1918 they should have immediately undertaken the reorganization of the German conscience, German honor, and the German will. They should have said: We will mobilize these forces and show ourselves as Germans all the more. At such times in particular a people must be proud and convinced that an art which at such a moment gives a people inner pride has never been excelled. If the National Socialists could win today, I cannot imagine that this Third Reich would fail to show the world that it is the incarnation of a different spirit. I cannot imagine that we would create a state which would be made up of perpetual tenement barracks, that this Third Reich would not again become an honorable representative of the German spirit. It would not be by means of the trashy theater productions of Mr. Reinhardt,‡ but with works which will outlast eternity, so that the world would still be able to see in the most distant future that these are the remains of the Third Reich. We oppose businesslike and purely commercial methods; we oppose the conception of our tourist bureaus that one can nourish or maintain a nation with that trash. We want to create monuments of stone and metal out of our new *Weltanschauung*, out of our political will for power. Then the tourist bureaus may come again later and guide tourists around. We do this only for the sake of implanting once again into every single German mind the pride of being German. If fate should lead us to victory in this city,

**Ludwig I, King of Bavaria (1825-48).

†Ludwig II, King of Bavaria (1864-1886).

‡Max Reinhardt, German dramatist and theater director 1873—.

then we will begin in this city with the execution of our idea. We will give German art here for the first time a worthy place again in the belief that every 100,000 marks which is given to creative art is put to better use than when, as nowadays, it is wasted on an international theater Jew. This would not serve art and Munich would not be saved by doing so, but with those 100,000 marks a number of artists could live decently in Munich. If there is to be a rebirth, we have to fall back on this good reservoir of German art and artists. . . .

The countenance of this city is German. If Ludwig I, Ludwig II, or Richard Wagner should come forth today—these men who transformed a small provincial town into a great art metropolis—their criticism would be devastating. They would regret it still more that these means were given not to German art but to a foreign international Jew. To us this business of the [Jewish] theater signifies only a little intermezzo, from which nothing will remain but sad regret. What will remain, however, is the National Socialist Movement. It will grow and expand until the hour comes in which this Movement will take the helm of the German Reich into its hands, the hour in which German art will enjoy a rebirth. We are not worried that there might not then be any German artists. When the German people again achieves political unity, when it emerges from its decadence to a national and folkic rebirth, this will be such an event that our people will be stirred to the very depths of its soul. And from this spiritual revolution there will emerge the forces which will insure German works of art for this great German achievement of liberation. German genius will raise itself up and then one will not need a Jewish producer in order to make German cities worth seeing again. (Munich, April 3, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 5, 1929)

Art and Politics Are Inseparable

In all questions of art we will take a very definite stand ahead of time. That which we cannot understand because it is alien to us we do not need to understand; in fact, we do not want to understand it. If the cubist and dadaist painter tells me: Lose yourself in this picture, it represents the primeval order and the primeval substance [*die Urordnung und den Uraether*], then I say to that painter: If you wish to paint, then I wish to see it with my eyes; if you want to philosophize, then I want to follow you with my brain; but if you want me to grasp incomprehensible things by incomprehensible thinking, then go to the devil. We neither need your art nor want your art.

We do not wish to give our people art that is simply incomprehensible to the healthy human being. We are bold enough to declare that someday in some way or other we are going to clear out this Augean stable. If anyone objects by saying that some good things might be thrown out with the bad, then we will answer: In war-time good people have always been shot too. There can be no question for us whether to permit Reinhardt's productions or not. No! Foreign poison must be kept away from our people. . . .

In our opinion, art and politics belong together as nothing else on this earth. Everything that has been built in the great cultural centers was created with a political will as the determining factor. Do not think that the Pharaohs built their pyramids so that Cook's Travel Bureaus can make money or the steamship lines can do business. The reasons were political in nature. And if you say, no, religion was the reason, then we must answer: In those days the highest task of religion was still the preservation of the state. The time in which political parties used religion to destroy states came only later. Preservation of the state and of the people at that time was the reason for this manifestation of the royal will, in reality of the great, monumental racial will [*Rasse-Willens*] of a ruling class. Not one of the great monuments of culture which exists today owes its existence to any factor other than the political. There is Rome or Hellas. Not a single city of culture owes its existence to anything but the political hope and the political will to preserve inter-related monuments, testimonials of the unification of peoples, and to profess the overwhelming power of the central authority. . . . When Ludwig I created an art center he did not do it solely for the love of art, but because of pride and belief that Munich could in that way attain what could not be attained in any other way, namely, an importance which far surpassed her size.

For us politics and art are always closely connected. The political collapse of a people also drags art to the depths. Political ascendancy likewise pulls art up with it. I could not picture the victory of our *Weltanschauung* unless it were embodied in works of art that will live through the years as proof of the victory of our conviction. In the south of Europe we see a state [Italy] which is also producing great works in the field of art because a people has been rejuvenated with all its virtues and passions. . . . Only in times when peoples begin to develop, when they are seized by new ideas, do monuments of triumph generally appear. Then art also begins to live again. In our opinion that would be the only hope of a future for Munich. Munich is to become the center of the German will for freedom, the starting point

of the coming German war of liberation, and the site for the glorification of the regeneration of the German nation. Munich will then become again what it used to be: The city that one must have seen in order to know Germany. (Munich, Nov. 29, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 4, 1929)

The Necessity for Cultural Achievement

Art is not one of those human activities that may be laid aside to order and resumed to order. Nor can it be retired on a pension, as it were. For either a people is endowed with cultural gifts that are inherent in its very nature or it is not so endowed at all. Such gifts, therefore, are part of the general racial qualities of a people. The creative function, however, through which these spiritual gifts or faculties are expressed follows the same law of development and decay that governs all human activity. It would not be possible, for instance, to suspend the study of mathematics and physics in a nation without thereby causing a retrogression in the special faculties and aptitudes that are exercised in the pursuit of such studies. . . . For just the same reason, if the cultural activities of a people were suspended for a certain time the necessary result would be a general retrogression throughout the whole cultural sphere. This would end in a process of internal decay.

Let us take an example. Opera may be looked upon as one of the most characteristic creations of the neo-classical theater. Now, if the activities involved in operatic production were to be suspended for a longer or shorter period of time, even though only temporarily, with the intention of restoring opera once again in its old brilliance—what would be the consequence? There would be a suspension of the training and preparation of the personnel necessary for such productions. But the consequences would not end there. They would extend to the general public; for the receptive faculties of the public, in regard to this particular form of art, have to be developed and trained by the constant production of opera, just as in the case of the performers themselves.

The same holds good for art in general. No era can shelve the duty of cultivating the arts. If it should try to do so it would lose not only the capacity for creative artistic expression but also its powers of comprehending and appreciating such expression, because the creative and receptive faculties are here inter-dependent. Through the appeal of his work, the creative artist vitalizes and ennobles the aesthetic

faculties of the nation. The general feeling for artistic values, thus awakened and developed, becomes a rich spiritual nursing ground for the growth and increase of new creative talent.

But if, by reason of its very nature, such culture activity cannot be suppressed for a longer or shorter period without causing irremediable damage, such a suppression or neglect would be particularly wicked when the economic and political situation expressly calls for a reinforcement of the moral strength of the nation. It is important that this should be clearly understood. The cultural achievements which mark outstanding periods in human history were always coexistent with a high degree of social development. Whether they belong to the material or spiritual order, it can be said that such works always incorporated the most profound elements of the national being. Never is it more necessary to direct the mind of a people towards the vital and inexhaustible powers of its inner being than when political, social, and economic troubles tend to weaken faith in the nobler qualities which the nation incarnates and thereby hinder the fulfillment of its mission. When the poor human soul, oppressed with cares and troubles and inwardly distracted, has no longer a clear and definite belief in the greatness and the future of the nation to which it belongs, that is the time to stimulate its regard for the indisputable evidences of those eternal racial values which cannot be affected in their essence by a temporary phase of political or economic distress. The more the natural and legitimate demands of a nation are ignored or suppressed, or even simply denied, the more important it is that these vital demands should take on the appeal of a higher and nobler right by giving tangible proof of the great cultural values incorporated in the nation. Such visible demonstration of the higher qualities of a people, as the experience of history proves, will remain for thousands of years as an unquestionable testimony not only to the greatness of a people but also to their moral right to existence. Even though the last representatives of such a people should submit to the final disgrace of having their mouths closed forever, then the stones themselves will cry out. History pays scarcely any positive regard to a people that has not left its own monument to bear witness to its cultural achievement. On the other hand, those who have destroyed the artistic monuments of a foreign race remain only a subject of regret for the historian.

What would the Egyptians be without their pyramids and their temples and the artistic decorations that surrounded their daily lives? What would the Greeks be without Athens and the Acropolis? What would the Romans be without their mighty buildings and engineering

works? What would the German emperors of the Middle Ages be without their cathedrals and their imperial palaces? What would the Middle Ages itself be without its town halls, and guild halls, and the like? What would religion be without its churches? That there was once such a people as the Mayas we should not know at all, or else be unconcerned about them, had they not left for the admiration of our time those mighty ruins of cities that bear witness to the extraordinary epic qualities of that people, such ruins as have arrested the attention of the modern world and are still a fascinating object of study for our scholars. A people cannot live longer than the works which are the testimony of its culture.

If artistic works, therefore, have more powerful and more durable repercussions than any other human activity, then the cultivation of the arts becomes all the more necessary in an age that is oppressed and distracted by an unfavorable political and economic situation. For art is more effective than any other means that might be employed for the purpose of bringing home to the consciousness of a people the truth of the fact that their individual and political sufferings are only transitory, whereas the creative powers and therewith the greatness of the nation are everlasting. Art is the great mainstay of a people, because it raises them above the petty cares of the moment and shows them that, after all, their individual woes are not of such great importance. Even if such a nation should go down in defeat and yet have produced cultural works that are immortal, in the eye of history that nation will have triumphed over its adversary. . . .

If the National Socialist Movement is to have a real revolutionary significance it must strive to give tangible proof of this significance by authentic creative work in the cultural sphere. It must make the people conscious of their collective mission and of the particular mission of National Socialism by encouraging and aiding such artistic production as will demonstrate to the people their own cultural resources. The work of the National Socialist Movement and the struggle it has to carry on will become all the more easy insofar as it can effectively impress on the public mind an understanding of the greatness of the aims it has in view. This understanding has always been the result of great cultural achievements, especially in the domain of architecture.

If the nation is to be trained to take pride in itself, the just motives of that pride must be placed before its eyes. The labor and sacrifices which the construction of the Parthenon demanded were the work of one time; but it has been an everlasting source of pride to the Greeks

and an object of universal admiration for their contemporaries and for posterity. We also ought to nourish the hope that Providence will grant us great geniuses who may express the soul of our people in everlasting concord of sounds or in stone. We know of course that here as elsewhere the hard saying applies: Many are called but few are chosen. But we are convinced that in the political sphere we have discovered a fitting mode of expression for the nature and will of our people. We feel, therefore, that we are also capable of recognizing and discovering in the cultural sphere the complementary expression which will be adequate to that nature and that will. We shall discover and encourage artists who will imprint on the new German State the cultural stamp of the German race. . . .

All the great cultural achievements in the history of mankind have been the product of those forces which spring from the feeling of communion in the social group, so that such works may be said to originate in the community itself. Hence they reflect in their genesis and final form the spiritual life and ideals of the community. It is, therefore, no accident that all the great communities in history which were inspired and formed by a definite concept of the world and life, religious or philosophical, have striven to perpetuate themselves through the medium of great cultural works. In those epochs of religious intensity, where material cares were set aside as far as possible, the human mind achieved the greatest cultural triumphs.

The contrary was the case with Judaism. Infected by the spirit of capitalism through and through, and directing their actions accordingly, the Jews never produced an art that was characteristically their own, and will never create such a thing. Although this people for long periods in its history has had immense individual fortunes at its disposal, it never created an architectural style of its own, nor have the Jews been able to produce a music that reflects their racial characteristics. Even in the building of the Temple at Jerusalem foreign architects had to be employed to help in giving it final shape, just as most of the Jewish synagogues nowadays are the work of German, French, and Italian artists. I am convinced, therefore, that after a few years under the National Socialist leadership of state and people, the Germans will produce much more and greater work in the cultural domain than has been accomplished during the recent decades of the Jewish regime. . . .

Not merely artistic considerations but also political considerations must determine us to turn our eyes to the great examples of the past and drawn from them inspiration and guidance in our efforts to con-

struct an artistic counterpart which will worthily embody the spirit of the new Reich. The poltroon is most effectively forced to stop his grumbling when he is confronted with the eternal diction of great art. The centuries bow to it in silent veneration. May God give us that greatness of spirit which will enable us to formulate our plans in a manner worthy of our national greatness. That, of course, is an arduous undertaking.

The heroic achievements of our people during the last 2,000 years belong to the epic deeds of human history. In Germany, as well as in the rest of Europe, there were centuries during which the triumphs of art were a worthy antiphon to the greatness of the human spirit in those ages. The sublime grandeur of our cathedrals constitutes an incomparable precedent for the architectural creations of our own time. It is not merely our aesthetic feeling of veneration that is stirred by the sight of those great cathedrals; they also force us to bow in admiration before the generations of men who conceived such vast ideas and brought them to realization.

In doing homage to the eternal genius of the nation, we call upon the great spirits that presided over that creative power in the past to come to our assistance now. Men grow great to match the greatness of the tasks they undertake. We have no reason to doubt that, if the Almighty grants us the courage to undertake something that will be immortal, He will also give our people the strength to carry it out. Our cathedrals bear witness to the grandeur of the past. The greatness of the present will be measured by the immortal quality of the works it leaves to posterity. Thus and thus alone will it be possible for Germany to experience a renaissance of art and thus will it be possible to awaken in the people the consciousness of the high destinies to which they are called. (Nuremberg, Sept. 11, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 12, 1935)

National Socialist Art

If the silly talk about the international character of art is as stupid as it is dangerous, it is no less harmful to believe that politics and culture are two separate and absolutely unrelated things. No, quite the contrary! If culture is regarded as the greatest communal achievement [*Gemeinschaftsleistung*], and this communal achievement is made possible only by the existence of still greater communal structures, then culture is necessarily inseparably connected with those eternally creative forces which go to make up the human community,

uphold it, and lend it the flight of their mightier intellect. All human progress is transitory; it is continually being replaced by new realizations, experiences, and the material results issuing therefrom. One sometimes hears the seemingly correct and yet so senseless remark that economy is the basis of any art. No! No! The basis for both economy and art is the state, that is, the political power of organization and leadership which lies in the people. . . .

The greatest cultural achievements of mankind have always owed their conception, their incentive, and their realization to that authoritative will which has created and guided human communities. The authoritative will has at all times been the greatest advocate of art. It prescribes not only the general conditions for cultural achievements, but also the very forms. The more powerful the authority of the political will has been in the history of peoples and states, the greater has been their cultural achievement. . . .

It is a great mistake to believe that any human community would get along much more easily if it did without certain cultural achievements. Wealth and poverty, like everything else in this world, are in the final analysis only relative concepts. He who thinks only about material goods will always be very poor. But he who succeeds in diverting a people from materialistic aims to idealistic aims will suffer the least from the want of material goods. Marxism only incites the material instincts because it believes it has found in them a medium comprehensible to that great mass within the nation which did not help to build the states but was only given shape when the state was formed. Marxism makes an appeal to the most primitive instincts which, once incited, can be most readily used for the destruction of the community, which has to limit the freedom of the individual in order to facilitate the life of all, and which can improve the material well-being of all only through the idealistic sacrifices of the individual. In erecting temples to their gods, religions direct humanity away from the eternally insufficient satisfaction of individual desires toward the more noble realization of a common ideal. They build a mighty monument to faith which even superficial people cannot just disregard but which admonishes and at the same time elevates them. Only in this way should one regard and evaluate the usefulness of art. . . .

In an age of destructive decomposition and general decay, we are strengthening the structure of the community of our folkic life on this earth for the purpose of greater achievement and therewith of acquiring greater benefit for every individual within this community. If only the tremendous significance of the slow formation of a new, un-

shakable, self-possessed authority would be understood by all those whose existence absolutely requires such an authority! If only our economists, our religious leaders, but above all the adherents, promoters, builders, and creators of our German culture would understand that! If all of them would only grasp and understand that this task of restoring an absolute authority—one not subject to destructive criticism—is, in times when anarchist destructive tendencies are apparent everywhere, the most important task ever given man to execute! If only they would understand that all quibbling and questioning of this authority is a sin against our community, that every weakening of this authority must result in a paralyzation of the will of the community and therewith in the dissolution of the structure of the community! If only they would understand that the restoration of this type of authority would help us overcome all other difficulties and that, on the other hand, the loss of this authority through anarchism would inevitably lead to that greatest of catastrophes of which Europe has already seen some signs! If only they would understand that the outcome of this catastrophe would be the reign of anarchy or the restoration of a still more brutal authority!

Our cultural leaders should realize, however, that this type of authority can be a true blessing for the cultural development of our people only when it is rooted in the blood of our people. In that way alone can the basis for an ascendance of our people in all phases of human culture be created. Our cultural leaders should realize, therefore, that the National Socialist State, if it really wants to accomplish its task, like all other similar great creations in this world, needs, wants, and will create a cultural foundation. They should realize at the same time that the building of human society is conceivable only when personal liberty, that is, unrestrained license, is limited for the sake of greater unity. They should realize that in the cultural sphere too a general standard must be found which will allow the creations of the individual to be filled with a great idea, which will take from these creations the unrestrained arbitrariness of purely private conception and which will give to them the impulse of a common *Weltanschauung*.

Just as in periods of regeneration political life cannot be permitted to run wild, so in time of tranquility the individual member of society cannot be permitted to follow his inclinations without regard for others, that is, to sin against his fellow-men. Just as in such periods it cannot be permitted that economy be directed only for private interests and according to personal conceptions or for personal

gain, so also art and cultural development cannot be left in such times to the conceptions of the individual. For these conceptions are not concerned with the preservation of the community; only too often do they believe that they do not have any obligations to that community and to its particular problems. This is a great mistake.

A Christian age can have only Christian art, a National Socialist age only National Socialist art. Just as the National Socialist State will select the tasks to be performed in the cultural field and has done so already, so it will also watch over their realization. In Germany, therefore, the period of Bolshevik infatuation in art has come to an end, for this Bolshevik and futurist art is anarchial retrogression. National Socialist art, however, must serve the development of our community. National Socialist art, therefore, can no longer tolerate the symbols of the decadent world behind us, the democratic destructive qualities of which carried over visibly into the cultural field. We love that which is healthy. The best that is in our people in respect to body and soul is to be the determining measure. We want our art to glorify only that and nothing else. Our law of beauty shall always read: Health. In the field of architecture this means clarity, purposefulness, and—coming out of these two—again beauty. . . . We see a new generation grow up about us. Light, air, and sunshine have given us a new ideal. In the bodily beauty of this new generation we are experiencing the renaissance of a new and true art. Its wholesomeness is a guarantee of its agreement with our other political wishes and actions.

By deciding to make the health and therefore the feeling for beauty of this new type of person the measure of cultural achievement, we shall also constructively pave the way for the noble, truly eternal form [of art] which is based on the constant nature of our people. Our cultural leadership of the people must reach into all phases of artistic creation. And already today we have the confirmation that this striving is not just an attempt but that it is becoming a realization. Just as in the field of politics we are freeing our people from the anarchial elements of decay and destruction, so we will also eliminate more and more in the cultural field those who either intentionally or because of lack of ability aided or still wish to aid in laying the cultural foundation for political collapse. The National Socialist State will put this knowledge to practical use. In this connection we know that the uniform education of a people is not assured by announcing one and the same thing in all places at one and the same time, but by

revealing the new creed to the world for the first time at one given time and at one given place.

Thus we also begin our cultural activities with a number of mighty documentary achievements, in the conviction that immortal example is always the best teacher. For this mighty example has the power to achieve that which the anarchists abhor—namely, form and therewith the creation of style. We are again determined to create out of the variety of our individual cultural achievements the one great style of a mutually and increasingly complementary communal activity. This is the purpose of the tremendous construction programs which we have carried out and are about to carry out in various parts of the Reich. This is why this new Nuremberg of our party conventions is being established. Here in tremendous proportions a document of style-creating type must be created which at the same time will be for millions of Germans a monument of pride in belonging to this community. And out of this same spirit and for this identical purpose we are remodeling the capital of the Movement [Munich] and therefore will undertake the rebuilding of Berlin as the capital of the German Reich. The great works created in these places will give our people cause for joy not only in the present, but they will also fill them with pride in the future. (Nuremberg, Sept. 9, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 10, 1936)

The Cultural Duty of the Third Reich

How many Germans have any acquaintance with the great masterpieces of our art? And above all, how many Germans were consciously educated to appreciate these works? . . . I believe that we can do German history and our descendants no better cultural service than to foster with reverent care all that the great masters of the past have bequeathed to us. If a very small circle of over-bred degenerates fails to find any satisfaction in the originality of this true German art, or is not interested in it any more, and instead of that turns back to a "primitiveness" peculiar to its own talents, then it is certainly our duty to lead the uncorrupted people back to this German art of ours without taking any consideration of these others. It is an insult to the great men of our past to suppose that they only lived, wrote, and composed for a small number of thoroughly corrupt and indolent people. The nation is, however, far too simple and natural not to be moved by the greatness of its old masters. Ask the crowds which attend, first the exhibition of "Degenerate Art" and then the exhibi-

tion of German art, or which visit the works of art in our museums, what impresses them more. Ask these uncorrupted people—and you will receive an unqualified reply. But do not ask those representatives of a certain intellectual decadence, who are degenerate in body and soul, for these are not the German people!

It is, therefore, the first great task of the new Third Reich to foster carefully the cultural works of the past and to try to bring them to the great masses of the people. But this must be done advisedly, liberally, and reasonably, as it is quite clear that a man who is tired out by the day's work or has worries is not always capable of dealing with very difficult problems of art. The man who has to contend with worries stands in greater need of a good laugh than the man life smiles upon. The theater must therefore provide not only drama but comedy as well, and admittedly only a certain percentage of those for whom a good operetta is a real work of art will appreciate grand opera. But so far from being detrimental, it is good. The decisive factor is that we take the trouble to lead our people once more along this road through joy and beauty to the sublime if possible. And it is no proof of the unworthiness of a nation if it cries out for games as well as bread. It would, on the other hand, prove the inferiority of a man if he were to see the task and aim of his life solely in eating and drinking.

Whether and in how far we have been successful in increasing the German people's appreciation of the theater and, with it, of poetry and music, each individual can easily find out for himself. A change has come about in this direction since 1933, which is almost a revolution. It is not in vain that one of the biggest organizations of all time has been set up with the worthy aim of giving the people, through joy, the strength to assert themselves in life, and of teaching them manfully to bear the hardships of life, but also readily to grasp its happiness as well.* Those, however, who claim that such a view of life has injured their prudish inner feelings will have had the opportunity of realizing from the trials of the past few months that it is much better to allow full scope to the normal physical demands of our bodies than stupidly to do violence to the nature that God has implanted in us.

If the new state appears in some spheres merely in a conserving capacity, it acts in another sphere in a creative capacity. Never in German history have greater and more noble edifices been planned, begun, and erected than at the present time. And this is the most important

*The reference here is to the movement "Strength Through Joy."

thing, for architecture also affects sculptural art as well as painting. It is, side by side with music, the most powerful art ever invented by man. It too has been dishonored for decades past. Under the battle cry of "objectivity" it too was degraded to the level of artistic nonsense and even fraud. During the creative poverty of a bourgeois, liberalistic era the construction of public buildings failed in ever increasing measures to keep pace with that of industry, banks, exchanges, department stores, hotels, bourgeois capitalistic and cooperative institutions, and the like. In the same manner, however, that National Socialism places above these associations of interests the greater community of the nation and the people, so will it also give the works of this community preference in representation compared with private parties. This is decisive! The greater the demands made by the present state upon its citizens, the more impressive and powerful must the state also appear to them. . . .

There is no great epoch in the life of a nation in which the interests of the community have not endeavored to give visible expression to their overtowering importance by means of great architectural works. The performances and the achievements of this aspiration have, however, first shown mankind the real meaning of the community spirit and thus secured the prerequisites for the creation and maintenance of human culture, instead of leaving it to the assiduous struggles of purely economic interests directed towards profits or dividends, and so forth. This great monumental emphasis of the community has helped to build up an authority without which neither permanent society nor economic activities within the community could exist. It does not matter whether this authority is centered in religious institutions or in secular institutions.

The authority which in any case saved the German nation from collapse in the twentieth century and which snatched it back from the chaos of Bolshevism is, however, not the authority of an economic association, but that of the National Socialist Party and consequently of the National Socialist State! Our opponents will suspect, but our supporters above all things must know, that our edifices are created to strengthen this authority! What you see in the course of construction in this city, which is planned and in part already ripe for execution or even finished in Berlin and Munich, in Hamburg and other places, is intended to strengthen and support this authority! This is what lies behind these great buildings! And while we believe in the eternity of this Reich of ours—insofar as we can reckon according to human standards—these edifices must also be eternal, that is, they

must not only conform to eternal demands with regard to the magnitude of their conception, but also in the clarity of their ground-plans and in the harmony of their proportions.

The small requirements of every-day life have changed in the course of thousands of years and will go on changing forever, but the great cultural monuments of granite and marble erected by man still stand after thousands of years. They alone represent the only lasting and permanent thing amid the transitory flight of all other phenomena. In decadent periods man has always sought and found in them eternal magic power, enabling him once more to master disorder and to bring about a new order of things in place of chaos. These edifices are, therefore, not intended for the year 1940 or even for the year 2000, but they are made to project, like the cathedrals of the past, into the millenia of the future. And if God today has made fighters out of poets and singers, he has at least given these fighters the necessary architects to provide safeguards that the success of this struggle shall find its imperishable affirmation in the monuments of a great art which occurs but once! Small minds will not be able to understand this, but then they also failed to understand our whole struggle. It may embitter our opponents, but their hatred has hitherto proved incapable of preventing our successes. There will be a time, however, when it will be clearly recognized what a great blessing radiates into the centuries from out of the enormous edifices of this epoch-making period.

It is these very monuments which will more than ever assist in uniting and strengthening our nation politically; in a social sense they will become for the Germans the basis of a proud feeling that they are one; they will, furthermore, prove the ridiculousness of other worldly differences compared with these mighty and gigantic witnesses of our community; and psychologically they will lend an unlimited pride and confidence to the citizens of our nation, namely, that of being German. These huge buildings will at the same time also represent a grand justification for the political strength of the German nation. This is not intended to be a power without culture, a force without beauty. For the armament of a nation is only morally justified insofar as the shield and sword are used for a higher purpose. Consequently we are not striving for the brutal power of a Ghengis Khan, but for a powerful empire in the form of a strong social and protected community as supporter and guardian of a higher culture! (Nuremberg, Sept. 7, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 8, 1937)

Eternal Contributions

We Germans are justified today in talking about a newly awakened cultural life. This cultural awakening, as a matter of fact, is confirmed not by mutual compliments and literary phrases, but rather by actual proof of cultural creative ability. German architecture, sculpture, painting, our theater and the like—all these offer today documentary proof of a period of artistic creative activity of so rich and violent a character as has rarely been equalled in past ages. And though the Jewish-democratic press is today still brazenly trying to distort the true picture, we actually know that German cultural achievements will in a few years have gained the recognition and acclaim of the world to a greater extent than our material accomplishments have succeeded in doing already today.

The buildings going up in the Reich at the present time will speak a more lasting and particularly more insistent language than the hodgepodge of our international cultural critics. What those miserable creatures are inventing and will continue to invent, the world will, perhaps even unfortunately, forget completely like so many other things. The gigantic works of art created in the sign of the cultural restoration of the Third Reich, however, will some day belong to the inalienable cultural heritage of the Occident, the same as the great cultural achievements of the world in the past do today.

Furthermore, it does not make any difference whether and how other peoples evaluate our cultural works, for we are convinced that since cultural relations are the most delicate expression of a racially determined talent, they cannot at all be understood, and therefore even less evaluated, by individuals or races unrelated or of different blood. We certainly are not taking any pains, therefore, to make German art palatable for international Jewry. We know that if ever a Jew has had or should ever in the future have an inner understanding of our German-Aryan culture, this could be explained only by the fact that somewhere at some time either by chance or accident, a drop of foreign blood crept into his pedigree and is now beginning to tell against the Jew. The Jews as a race are culturally absolutely unproductive; therefore it is understandable that they feel more attracted to the modes of expression of primitive Negro tribes than to great cultural works and achievements of truly creative races. As already emphasized—acclaim or rejection on the part of these Jewish-Marxist-democratic-international circles is not only inconsequential for our culture politics as regards correctness or incorrectness of our actions,

the value or lack of value of our achievements, but it is furthermore absolutely unimportant. Of much greater importance, on the other hand, is the reaction of our own people. The acclaim or rejection of our own people is for us the only valid criterion of our cultural activity. . . .

Art has always had an obligation toward its particular era. Unless it served and obeyed the spirit of the times, there was no art. Yes, even more, art was actually in the service of the tasks to be performed in a particular age, and thus helped to perform them. The importance of art lies not in a purely descriptive reproduction of the contents and evolution of an age, but rather in the most striking demonstration of the forces and ideals thereof—regardless of whether these happen to be of religious, cultural, or political origin, or whether they originate in a new *Weltanschauung*. . . . Thus the art of ancient Greece is not only a formal reproduction of Greek life or of Greek landscapes and peoples, it is a proclamation of the Greek body and mind. The art of ancient Greece does not make propaganda for a separate work of art, for the subject or for the artist, but it makes propaganda for the Greek world as such—for the Greek world as we see it in ancient Greece. A cultural ideal rises before us which, thanks to its art and our own racially related origin, can still today give us a compelling idea of one of the most wonderful epochs in human history and of its most brilliant expositors. Roman art speaks in the same way for the imperial power of the Roman world. It is no accident that the disintegrating character of this Roman art coincides with social deterioration and the eventual political collapse of that ancient world power resulting therefrom. We likewise see in Christian art the herald of an age, the entire nature of which, its conception, ideas and actions, find a truly striking expression in its churches, sculpture, painting, music, and beyond that in the entire artistic treatment of life in general. Art today will also be the herald and proclaimer of the *Weltanschauung* and mental attitudes dominating our age. This is true not only because our age sets the tasks for the artists, but rather because the execution of those tasks can find appreciation only if the essence of the spirit of the times manifests itself therein. . . .

If National Socialism had not won out at the last moment in Germany and had it not overthrown the Jewish enemy, then, together with the respective political and human devaluation of our people planned by the Jews, our art would also have been progressively and persistently made more worthless, because it was made more foreign to the people. It is, therefore, self-understood that German art after our

victory—and only since then can we speak about such an art—receives and must receive its stimulus from that type of *Weltanschauung* that helped the National Socialist Revolution break through to victory. Since the purpose of this National Socialist Revolution is by no means the destruction of the values inherited from our historic past, it follows that the task of German art cannot consist primarily in emphasizing such a negative attitude toward the past, but rather to make a new and original contribution to the common cultural possessions of our people, which as an artistic heritage is no more than the collected cultural aggregate of our racially determined inheritance. For there is no such thing in this world as a new culture, just as there is no such thing as a new language or a new people. The culture of a nation is the aggregate wealth of cultural creations of thousands of years. The greatness of a cultural age cannot be measured by the degree to which it rejects past cultural achievements, but rather by the extent of its own cultural contribution. (Nuremberg, Sept. 6, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 7, 1938)

10

Strategy of Peace

The world must know that my love of peace is the longing for peace of the entire German people.

Cologne, Oct. 26, 1933

God knows I wanted peace.

Berlin, May 4, 1941

One of Hitler's shrewdest propagandist offensives has been his strategy of peace. Through this subtle technique he has sought to conceal his ulterior motives behind a smokescreen of reassuring oratory, to confuse and mislead his enemies until the international scales were tilted in his favor so that he could launch an aggressive policy of territorial aggrandizement. Once he had finally plunged Europe into war, he tried to absolve himself of responsibility by insisting that the conflict had been unjustly forced upon him. Since then, he has continued to preach international conciliation in order to pave the way for a negotiated settlement and to isolate and eliminate his opponents as he had done in the years before 1939.

Naive indeed are those German apologists who assert that the world was plunged into war because Hitler's so-called peace efforts were ignored. England and France declared war on Germany because Hitler drove them to it. Certainly his destruction of Czechoslovakia and his invasion of Poland made it unmistakably clear that he did not believe in peace.

Hitler's plaintive pleas have from the first been an essential part of a clever stratagem. In the light of his overt actions, how else can his pacific professions be interpreted? If he had not intended to seize Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland, why was it necessary for him to give his word to the contrary?

The Fuehrer's strategy divided and immobilized opinion in Europe and contributed to the material and psychological unpreparedness of the democracies. However effective, his techniques recoiled on his own head. After Munich every responsible statesman knew that the Nazis would never keep a promise, that a Pax Hitleriana meant the end of Western civilization, that the dynamics of Nazi conquest and the methods implicit in their system would never permit peace.

Violence Is Futile

No new European war could hope to substitute something better for the unsatisfactory conditions of the present day. On the contrary, the application of violence of any kind in Europe could neither from the political or economic point of view create a more favorable state of affairs than that which exists at present. Even if a new European act of violence had a decisive result, the ultimate effect would be to increase the disturbance of European equilibrium, and this, in one manner or another, would sow the seed of further conflicts and complications. New wars, new uncertainty, and another economic depression would be the result. The outbreak of such madness would necessarily cause the collapse of the present social and political order. A Europe sinking into Communistic chaos would bring about a crisis the extent and duration of which could not be foreseen.

It is the earnest desire of the National Government of the German Reich to prevent such a disturbing development by means of its honest and active cooperation. . . . Speaking deliberately as a German National Socialist, I desire to declare in the name of the National Government, and of the whole Movement of national regeneration, that we in this new Germany are filled with deep understanding for the same feelings and opinions and for the rightful claims to life of the other nations. The present generation of this new Germany, which so far has only known in its life the poverty, misery, and distress of its own people, has suffered too deeply from the madness of our time to be able to contemplate treating others in the same way. Our boundless love for and loyalty to our own national traditions makes us respect the national claims of others and makes us desire from the bottom of our hearts to live with them in peace and friendship. (Berlin, May 17, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 18, 1933)

Toward a Brotherhood of Man

No war can become the permanent condition of mankind; no peace can be the perpetuation of war. A time must come when victor and vanquished must find the way once more to a common understanding and mutual trust. . . . The German Government is most profoundly convinced that its appeal to the whole German nation will prove to the world that the Government's love of peace, and also its views on the subject of honor, represent the longing for peace and the code of honor of the entire nation. In order to prove this assertion, I have decided

to request the Reich President to dissolve the German Reichstag and, at the general election combined with a plebiscite, to provide the German nation with the opportunity of making a historical declaration, not only for the purposes of approving the Government's principles, but also for the purpose of testifying unconditional association with them.

May the world be convinced by such an affirmation that, in this struggle for equality of rights and honor, the German nation declares that it holds identically the same views as its Government. May the world also be convinced that both are inspired by no other wish than to cooperate in putting an end to an epoch of tragic errors and regrettable quarrels among those who, as inhabitants of the most important cultural continent of all, have a common mission to fulfill in the future towards the whole of humanity. May this great demonstration of our people for peace and honor succeed in providing the inter-relationship of European states with that prerequisite necessary, not only for terminating centuries-old discord and strife, but for rebuilding a better community of nations through the recognition of a higher common duty arising out of common equal rights. (Berlin, Oct. 14, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 15/16, 1933)

War Abhorred

The German people do not want war. On the contrary, because the German people loves peace, it fights for its vital rights and champions the conditions necessary for the existence of our nation of 65,000,000. Germany and the German people have no reason to desire a war in order to reestablish the honor of the nation and the honor of its men and soldiers. Our goal is to make our people happy again by assuring them daily bread. This is a tremendous task, and the world, therefore, should leave us in peace.

We want nothing but our peace and quiet in order to be able to work. And the world should know that for this work the entire nation stands together, man for man, woman for woman, even down to the youth. . . . The German people today is united as one unit. It is our life's work to establish an organization which will guarantee that this unity will never be lost. In that we pursue this goal with all our zeal, we best champion the peace of the world. There is no better guarantee for the peace of the world than the fanatical unity of the German nation. (Kelheim, Oct. 22, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 24, 1933)

Peace and Friendship

We assure the world that the German Government and the German people have only one wish: To live in peace and friendship with all nations in order to be able to finish their internal reconstruction. If the world declares that this is only the assurance of the government to which one can attach no credence because the people think quite differently, then I will simply appear before the German people and summon them to disprove this contention of the world, inasmuch as the entire German people stand unitedly as one witness for the truthfulness of this assertion. . . .

If the others say that we cannot fulfill our obligations because present-day Germany is desirous of war, then I can but stand before the world as Chancellor of the nation and say—that is not true, the German people has nothing to do with that. It is not true if you declare that this people out of hate and revenge wants to begin a war. No, they want their peace and their quiet, and, to be sure, their honor and their legitimate rights. (Kiel, Nov. 6, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 7, 1933)

The Spirit of Reconciliation

The National Socialist racial concept and the science underlying it do not lead to the underrating or disparagement of other peoples, but rather to the recognition of the duty to preserve and maintain the life of our own people. Hence it leads inevitably to a natural respect for the life and character of other peoples. It thus frees foreign political activities from any attempt to subjugate other peoples in order to rule them or to incorporate them as a mere numerical mass in one's own nation by imposing a foreign language upon them. This new concept compels a great and fanatical devotion to the life and thus to the honor and freedom of one's own people and in like manner a respect for the honor and freedom of other peoples. This idea can provide, therefore, an essentially better basis for the effort toward a true pacification of the world than the sorting of the nations from mere considerations of power into groups of victors and vanquished, into groups of those which are self-justified and those which have been subdued and possess no rights. . . .

When the President of the Reich entrusted me on January 30, 1933 with the leadership of the new government, I and with me not only the members of the Cabinet but also the entire German people were

moved solely by one ardent desire, that Almighty God would permit us to win back for the German people its honor and equality of rights in the eyes of the world. As honest adherents of a sincere policy of reconciliation, we believed that this was the best way in which we could contribute to a genuine peace among the nations. We have adopted this idea as the guiding principle of our entire foreign policy. The German Reich solemnly proclaimed to all nations and states that it was animated solely by the wish to live with them in peace and friendship. We were convinced that it must be possible once more in this world to discuss differences in international life without always thinking of force. . . .

At this time I can only once again repeat to the world that no threat and no force will ever move the German people to give up those rights of which a sovereign nation cannot be deprived. I can, however, also give assurance that this sovereign nation has no other wish than to apply the strength and weight of her political, moral, and economic resources not only to the healing of the wounds which the past has inflicted on humanity, but also towards the cooperation of those cultured and civilized nations which—as an English statesman has justly said—make life in this world really fine and worth living by their labors and spiritual achievements.

One year after the National Socialist Revolution finds the German Reich and the German people better qualified to assume that share of responsibility for the prosperity and happiness of all peoples, which Providence has assigned to so great a nation and which therefore human beings cannot dispute. Our readiness for this truly international duty could have no more appropriate symbol than the person of the aged Marshal, who as an officer and victorious leader fought for the greatness of our people in wars and battles and today as President of the Reich is the most venerable guarantor of the work for peace in which we are all engaged. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

Peace Preferred

If present-day Germany advocates peace, it does so neither because of weakness nor because of cowardice. It advocates peace for a different reason, a reason which National Socialism acquired from the people and the state. For National Socialism regards the forcible amalgamation of one people with another alien people not only as a worthless political aim but in the long run as a danger to the internal unity

and hence the strength of a people. National Socialism, therefore, dogmatically rejects the idea of national assimilation. This disposes of the bourgeois belief in potential "Germanization."

It is neither our wish nor our intention to deprive alien sections of our population of their nationalism, language, or culture, in order to replace these by something German and therefore foreign to these groups. We issue no directions for the Germanization of non-German names; on the contrary, we do not wish this. Our racial theory regards every war for the subjection and domination of an alien people as a proceeding which sooner or later changes and weakens the victor internally and eventually brings about his defeat. We do not believe for a moment that those people in Europe who are so thoroughly nationalized could even be denationalized in an age that sees the principle of nationalism so dominant. The last 150 years provide more than enough instructive warnings of this. In no future war will the European national states be able to achieve—apart from the temporary weakening of their opponents—more than petty adjustments of national frontiers, of little consequence in comparison with the sacrifices which will be made.

The permanent state of war that will be established between the various nations by such intentions may perhaps appear advantageous to various political and economic interests. For the nations, however, it merely means burdens and misfortune. The blood which has been shed on the European continent in the course of the last 300 years stands in no proportion to the national results obtained. In the end France has remained France, Germany Germany, Poland Poland, and Italy Italy. What dynastic egoism, political passion, and patriotic blindness achieved in the way of apparently far-reaching political changes, by shedding rivers of blood, has done no more than scratch the surface of the nations, as far as national feeling is concerned. It has not substantially altered their fundamental characters. If these states had applied merely a fraction of their sacrifices to wiser purposes, their success would certainly have been greater and more permanent.

When I, as a National Socialist, advocate this view in all frankness, I am also influenced by the realization that the principal effect of every war is to destroy the flower of the nation. . . . National Socialist Germany wants peace because of its fundamental convictions. Germany also wants peace because she recognizes the simple primitive fact that no war would essentially alter the distress in Europe. It would probably increase it. Present-day Germany is engaged in the tre-

mendous work of repairing her internal damage. None of our practical projects will be completed before a period of from ten to twenty years. None of our tasks of an ideal nature can be completed before fifty or perhaps one hundred years. I started the National Socialist Revolution by bringing the Movement into being, and since then I have directed the Revolution. I know that none of us will live to see more than the very beginning of this great revolutionary development. What else could I wish than peace and tranquility? But if it is said that this is merely the desire of the leaders, I can reply that if only the leaders and rulers desire peace, the nations themselves will never wish for war. . . .

I cannot better conclude my speech of today to you, my fellow fighters and trustees of the nation, than by repeating our confession of faith in peace. The nature of our new constitution makes it possible for us in Germany to put a stop to the machinations of the war-mongers. May the other nations, too, succeed in giving bold expression to their real inner longing for peace. Whoever lights the torch of war in Europe can wish for nothing but chaos. We, however, live in the firm conviction that our time will witness not the decline but the renaissance of the West. It is our proud hope and our unshakable belief that Germany can make an imperishable contribution to this great work. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

Reasonableness and Unreasonableness

The present fateful tensions in Europe, which we now experience, are also the result of that folly which believed that the natural rights of the nations could be circumvented. There are politicians today who seem to feel themselves safe only when the means of livelihood in neighboring states are as unfavorable as possible. Indeed, the worse these conditions are, the more triumphant do these politicians believe their own far-seeking policy to have been. I should like the German people to learn a lesson from this unreasonableness and not to make the same mistakes themselves. I should like the German nation to recognize those historical realities in other peoples which fancy would like to banish by wishful thinking but which, as a matter of fact, cannot be obliterated. I should like the German people to see that it is unreasonable to oppose these historical realities and to impose upon other nations conditions contrary to the proper requirements of their spiritual existence and also contrary to their reasonable and vital claims. . . .

How much sorrow would have been spared humanity and especially the peoples of Europe, if the natural and self-evident necessities of life had been respected and taken into account in the political readjustment of European living space. It would have been well, too, if economic cooperation had been given consideration. This, it seems to me, is absolutely essential if better and more peaceful results are to be achieved in the future. This applies especially to Europe. The European nations now represent one large family in this world—often somewhat quarrelsome but, despite everything, related to one another in diverse ways. Culturally and spiritually and economically they are indivisible. In fact, their break-up is unthinkable. Every attempt to regard and deal with the European problem by any other rule than that of calm and cool reason will lead to reactions that will be unpleasant for all. . . .

I now ask the German people to strengthen me in my faith and through the force of their will further to endow me with the strength to take a courageous stand at all times for their honor and their freedom and their economic welfare. I especially ask the German people to support me in my struggle to bring about a genuine peace. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

*Justice, Fairness, and Understanding**

It is my wish to solve the great differences among the nations in precisely the same way in which I solved our domestic problems—according to the principles of justice, fairness, and understanding. One could say perhaps: That is impossible, that is fantastic—such principles are ideologies. Well, I believe in these ideologies, and in this connection wonders have already been achieved. I do not approach the German people as a mere babbler. I can well say: These thoughts have guided me for three years and they have guided me well.

When I took over the government three years ago, the German people were surrounded by hostile elements in Europe. The worst part of it was that from all sides this mentality of hostility seemed to be based on so little reflection. Neither here nor anywhere else were problems thought through with sufficient calmness. Hate, suspicion, fear, and jealousy were allowed to enter in. I have attempted to bring understanding into Germany's relations with the outside world. I have

*This statement and the four which follow were expressed during the election campaign which was held after the reoccupation of the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland on March 7, 1936. The election took place March 29th.

attempted to build these relations upon the eternal principles that have proved to be just, namely, upon the principles of human homogeneity and human collaboration.

I have attempted to make clear to the world and the German people that Europe is a small concept, that in this small Europe no great displacements have occurred for centuries, that the problem here in Europe is one of a family of nations, and that the individual members of this family are infinitely set in their ways. I have tried to make it clear that they represent nations filled with tradition, looking back upon a great past, having a unique culture which they consider their own, and looking forward with pride to the future. I have attempted to make it clear to our people and, moreover, to others, that every bitter quarrel meets only with little temporary success. The European boundaries of the states may change, their peoples remain constant. (Karlsruhe, March 12, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 14, 1936)

A New Order of Reason

All of us here and all other peoples have the feeling that we have come to the end of an era. New concepts, new ideas, and new realities appear on the horizon. Not only we the vanquished but the victors too are sincerely convinced that somehow or another things have not been as they should be, that reason especially seems to have forsaken mankind, that it has been replaced by madness, hate, mistrust, and envy, out of which fear and anxiety have also emerged.

The nations perceive it everywhere. A new order must come, especially to this continent where the peoples are crowded so close to one another. The nations must find a new relationship to each other. A new structure must be built which will make living possible for all peoples and which will proceed from the conviction that the nations are realities of a historical nature, realities that one may, it is true, wish away, but realities that one cannot eradicate. And above this new order which must be set up will be the words: Reason and Logic! Understanding and Mutual Consideration! (Breslau, March 22, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 24, 1936)

The Good Neighbor Policy—German Brand

The peoples long for peace. Yes, indeed, but for a peace which permits them to live in equality side by side. I do not believe that there is a people today that seriously wants a neighboring people to

be oppressed. I do not believe that there is a people that wants a neighboring people to be humbled, that exacting demands be made of it, demands which bring the blush of shame to the face of every decent man. I do not believe this. . . .

It is the desire of this people to live in peace and friendship with other nations. It is the will of this people that peace shall be secured. It is the will of this people to make its contribution toward this peace. . . . I have announced to the world a program of international peace for a quarter of a century. That is why I have pledged my word and the word of the nation. I call upon Germany to show the rest of the world by her symbolic action on March 29th, that this gesture corresponds to her will. And I should like—I repeat—for the other statesmen to take this “symbolic action” into account. (Berlin, March 24, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 26, 1936)

The Voice of Eternal Morality

No one has the right to set himself as a judge in an affair which concerns my people alone. My people, therefore, is my judge in questions which concern Germany, not an international assembly. Because we wish to believe in the sanctity of treaties, we should like to present the conditions for their sanctity. This condition is that two equal partners out of their own free will, without being forced, should take the pen in hand and then put their signature to a treaty. That alone is a hallowed treaty. Everything else is the use of force. And if it should be said: Yes, but the paragraph [the wording of the treaty]! In answer to the question of paragraphs I raise the voice of eternal morality.

This is also a law: Thou shalt not kill thy neighbor, nor oppress him, nor use violence against him, nor plunder him. Thou shalt not do this. We do not wish to harm other peoples, but we also will not tolerate injury from others. I have proclaimed this election in order that there may not be the illusion that this idea of honor is just the idea of an individual but that it is the idea of honor of an entire people. The German people wants peace; it wants reconciliation; it wants tranquility. The German people wants to work. It wants to earn its daily bread and to live respectably. (Essen, March 27, 1936, *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 28, 1936)

A Musketeer's Viewpoint

When I speak of peace as I do, and am so attached to peace, then, my beloved German people, it is because I experienced war in a much different manner from that of so many of my international political opponents. I do not speak of those for whom the war was a profitable enterprise. I have reference to those who as incumbents of a higher position saw the war take its course from above and who acquired a glorified perspective toward war. It was not my good fortune to share this perspective. I was a musketeer. I went through the war from down under with all its horror and terror. I do not see war in the same light as those who possess this glorified perspective. Yet I believe that more people learned to know war in the way I learned to know it than in the manner of my political opponents.

For three years I have worked for the honor of my people; I have slaved and wearied myself with anxiety for their freedom and their equal rights. For three years I have worried myself about peace, and today I must give the world authentic proof that this worry, this anxiety, this hope, and also this determination stem not from just one person, but that they represent the virtues and the avowal of an entire people. (Cologne, March 28, 1936; *Koelnische Zeitung*, March 30, 1936)

No Thoughts of Revenge

German foreign policy, in contrast to that of the many democratic states, is rooted in and conditioned by our own *Weltanschauung*. The *Weltanschauung* of this new Reich is directed toward maintaining and safeguarding the existence of our German people. We are not interested in oppressing other peoples. We want to live happily according to our pattern and to let others live according to theirs. This concept, which is racially conditioned by our *Weltanschauung*, leads to a limitation of our foreign policy. Our aims are not unlimited or conditioned by chance, but are fixed by a determination to serve the German people alone, to maintain it in this world, and to assure its existence. . . .

Although today we have become free and strong through our own efforts, we are not moved by any feeling of hate toward other nations. We do not want to bear resentment. We know that peoples cannot be made responsible for what is past. Only a small unscrupulous clique of international profiteers and jobbers is to blame. These profiteers would not hesitate to ruin entire nations if it were necessary for their

profane interests. We bear no hatred toward the nations around us, and we have proved it. The German love for peace has been proved by facts. We had hardly begun the restoration of the German equality when I proposed a number of agreements to the rest of the world, as a visible sign of our renunciation of any so-called revenge. (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 27, 1938)

Nothing Against France and England

I have no warlike intentions against either England or France. Nor has the German nation any such intentions. Since I have been in office I have endeavored to re-establish gradually closer relations based on mutual confidence, especially with our opponents in the Great War. . . . Immediately after the settlement of the Saar question, I solemnly renounced all claims to a revision of the frontier settlement in the West for all time and not merely in theory, but also in practice. I have used the entire German propaganda service for the purpose of making my attitude known and eliminated everything which could possibly have given rise to doubts or anxiety in Paris. You know my offers to England. I had only one great aim—that of concluding an honorable and friendly relationship with the British nation. . . .

If any nations are to be ruined, it will certainly not be the German nation. We are fighting for our rights. We have no desire for war. We have been attacked. Rather will those nations be ruined which only gradually discover what their betrayers had in store for them and what little reason they had to wage war—merely the desire for profit and the political interests of a small clique. . . . We are determined, come what may, to see this fight through and to hold to our own. Our only wish is that God Almighty, Who has now blessed our weapons, may enlighten the other nations, giving them the wisdom to recognize the futility of this war, this battle of nations, and that He may let them reflect on the blessings of a peace which they sacrificed simply because a handful of infernal war mongers and war profiteers want to drive the nations into war. (Danzig, Sept. 19, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 20, 1939)

The Outstretched Hand

If Europe is really sincere in her desire for tranquility and peace, then the states of Europe ought to be grateful that Russia and Germany are prepared to transform this hotbed [Poland] into an area of

peaceful development and that these two countries are willing to assume the responsibility and to make the sacrifices involved. For the German Reich this project, since it cannot be undertaken in an imperialistic spirit, is a task which it will take between fifty and one hundred years to perform. The justification for this activity on Germany's part lies in the political organization of this territory as well as in its economic development. In the long run, of course, all Europe will benefit from both. . . .

The most important condition for a real revival of economic life in and outside of Europe is the establishment of an unconditionally guaranteed peace and of a sense of security on the part of the individual nations. This security will not only be rendered possible by the final sanctioning of the European states, but above all by the reduction of armaments to a reasonable and economically tolerable level. An essential part of this necessary sense of security, however, is first a clear definition of the legitimate use and application of certain modern armaments which in their effect are suited to strike at the heart of every single nation and hence would leave behind a permanent sense of insecurity. In my previous speeches in the Reichstag I made proposals in this direction. At that time they were rejected—presumably for the simple reason that they were made by me; I believe, however, that a sense of national security will return to Europe only when clear and binding agreements provide a comprehensive definition of what constitutes a legal and illegal use of armaments. . . .

Already in this war with Poland I endeavored to use the air force only against so-called objectives of military importance or only to employ it to combat active resistance at a given point. But it must surely be possible to emulate the Red Cross in drawing up some fundamental and universally valid international regulation. It is only when this is achieved that peace can reign, particularly in our densely populated continent—a peace which, uncontaminated by suspicion and fear, will provide the prerequisite for real economic prosperity. I do not believe that there is any responsible statesman in Europe who does not in his heart desire prosperity for his people. Such a desire, however, is conceivable only if all the nations inhabiting this continent work together. To insure this cooperation must be the aim of every man who is working sincerely for the future of his own people. To achieve this great end, the leading nations on this continent will one day have to come together in order to draw up, accept, and guarantee a statute on a comprehensive basis which will ensure for them all a sense of security, of calm, in short, of peace. . . .

I do not for a single moment doubt that Germany will be victorious. Destiny will decide who is right. One thing only is certain. In the course of world history there have never been two victors, but very often only vanquished. This seems to me to have been the case in the last war. May those peoples and their leaders who are of the same mind now make their reply. And let those who consider war to be the better solution reject my outstretched hand. As *Fuehrer* of the German people and Chancellor of the Reich, I can only thank God at this moment that He has so wonderfully blessed us in our first hard struggle for our right, and pray that He may show us and all the other nations the correct way, so that not only the German people but all Europe may once more be granted the blessing of peace. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

Realism for Britain

On September 2nd, the conflict might still have been averted. Mussolini proposed a plan for the immediate cessation of all hostilities and for peaceful negotiations. Though Germany saw her armies storming to victory, I nevertheless accepted this proposal. It was only the Franco-British war mongers who desired war—not peace. More than that, as Mr. Chamberlain said, they needed a long war because they had now invested their capital in armament shares, had purchased machinery, and required time for the development of their business interests and the amortization of their investments. For, after all, what do these citizens of the world care about Poles, Czechs, or similar peoples? . . .

On October 6, 1939, at this very place, I addressed the German nation for the second time during this war. I was able to inform it of our glorious military victory over the Polish State. At the same time I appealed to the insight of the responsible men in the enemy states and to the nations themselves. I warned them not to continue this war, the consequences of which could only be devastating. I particularly warned the French of embarking on a war which would forcibly eat its way across the frontier, and which, irrespective of its outcome, would have appalling consequences. At the same time, I addressed this appeal to the rest of the world, although I feared as I expressly stated, that my words would not be heard, and would more than ever arouse the fury of the interested war mongers.

Everything happened as I predicted. Responsible elements in Britain and France scented, in any appeal, a dangerous attack on

their war profits. They therefore immediately began to declare that every thought of a conciliation was out of the question, nay even a crime, that the war had to be pursued in the name of civilization, of humanity, of happiness, of progress and, to leave no stone unturned, in the name of religion itself. For this purpose Negroes and bushmen were to be mobilized. Victory, they then said, would come of its own accord. It was in fact within their easy reach, as I myself must know very well, and have known for a long time since, or I should not have broadcast my appeal for peace throughout the world. For if I had had any justification for believing in victory, I should never have proposed an understanding with Britain and France without making any demands.

In a very few days these agitators had succeeded in representing me to the rest of the world as a veritable coward. For this peace proposal of mine I was abused and personally insulted. Mr. Chamberlain, in fact, spat upon me before the eyes of the world, and following the instructions of the instigators and war mongers in the background—men such as Churchill, Duff Cooper, Eden, Hore-Belisha and others—declined even to mention peace, let alone to work for it. Thus this ultra-capitalistic clique of people with a personal interest in the war clamored for its continuance. . . .

I have no desire to dwell on the sufferings brought on the soldiers in this war. Even greater is the misery caused by the unscrupulousness of those who drove millions from their homes without reason, merely in the hope of obstructing German military operations—an assumption which it is truly difficult to understand. As it turned out, the evacuation proved disastrous for the Allied operations, though far more terrible for the unfortunate evacuees. Neither in this world nor in the next, can Messrs. Churchill, and Reynaud answer for the suffering they have caused by their counsels and decrees to millions of people. All this, as I said once before, need never have happened. For, even in October, I asked nothing from either France or Britain but peace. But the men behind the armaments industries wanted to go on with the war at all costs—and now they have it.

I am too much of a soldier myself not to understand the misery caused by such a development. From Britain I now hear only a single cry—the cry, not of the people but of the politicians, that the war must go on! I do not know whether these politicians already have a correct idea of what the continuation of this struggle will be like. They do, it is true, declare that they will carry on with the war, and even if Great Britain should perish they would carry on from Canada. I

can hardly believe that they mean by this that the people of Britain are to go to Canada. Presumably only those gentlemen interested in the continuation of their war will go there. The people, I am afraid, will have to remain in Britain and the people in London will certainly regard the war with other eyes than their so-called leaders in Canada.

Believe me, gentlemen, I feel a deep disgust for this type of unscrupulous politician who wrecks whole nations and states. It almost causes me pain to think that I should have been selected by fate to deal the final blow to the structure which these men have already set tottering. It never has been my intention to wage wars, but rather to build up a state with a new social order and the finest possible standard of culture. Every year that this war drags on is keeping me away from this work, and the causes of this are nothing but ridiculous nonentities—as it were “Nature’s political misfits,” unless their corruptibility labels them as something worse.

Only a few days ago Mr. Churchill reiterated his declaration that he wants war. Some six weeks ago he began to wage war in a field where he apparently considers himself particularly strong, namely air raids on the civilian population, although under the pretense that the raids are directed against so-called military objectives. Since the bombardment of Freiburg these objectives are open towns, market-places and villages, burning houses, hospitals, schools, kindergartens, and whatever else may come their way. Until now I have ordered hardly any reprisals, but that does not mean that this is, or will be, my only reply.

I have often said that our answer, which will come one day, will bring upon the people unending suffering and misery. Of course, not upon Mr. Churchill for he, no doubt, will already be in Canada, where the money and children of those principally interested in the war have already been sent. For millions of other people, however, great suffering will begin. Mr. Churchill ought perhaps, for once, to believe me when I prophesy that a great Empire will be destroyed—an Empire which it was never my intention to destroy or even to harm. I do however realize that this struggle, if it continues, can end only with the complete annihilation of one or the other of the two adversaries. Mr. Churchill may believe that this will be Germany. I know that it will be different.

In this hour, I feel it to be my duty before my own conscience to appeal once more to reason and common sense in Great Britain as much as elsewhere. I consider myself in a position to make this appeal since I am not the vanquished, begging favors, but the victor speak-

ing in the name of reason. I can see no reason why this war must go on. I am grieved to think of the sacrifices which it will claim. I should like to avert them, also for my own people. I know that millions of Germans, young and old alike, are burning with the desire at last to settle accounts with the enemy who, for the second time, has declared war upon us for no reason whatever. But I also know that at home there are many women and mothers who, ready as they are to sacrifice all they have in life, are yet bound to it by their very heartstrings. Possibly, Mr. Churchill will again brush aside this statement of mine by saying that it is merely born of fear and of doubt in our final victory. In that case, I shall have relieved my conscience in regard to the things to come. (Berlin, July 19, 1940; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 21, 1940)

Endless Rejections

We demanded nothing of others. When France entered this war, there was no reason for her to do so. It was only that she wanted to fight Germany again. She said, "We want the Rhineland. We want to tear Germany apart, tear Austria away and dissolve Germany." With such wild fantasies, simply impossible in the twentieth century with its nationalist ideals, they pictured the overthrow of the Reich. It was all utterly childish.

And Britain? I have offered her my hand again and again. It was the very essence of my program to come to an understanding with her. There was only one question: The return of the German colonies. I stated that we were willing to discuss the matter. Time was of no importance, and I fixed no limit. . . .

Even after the war had begun, there were possibilities for an agreement. Immediately after the Polish campaign, I again offered my hand. I demanded nothing from France or Britain. Still, all was in vain. Immediately after the collapse in the West, I again offered my hand to Britain. Howls and shouts were my only reception. They literally spat on me. They were outraged. Very well, it is all in vain. Financial interests are victorious over the genuine interests of the people. The blood of nations must again serve the money of this small international group. Thus the fight started. Thus will it continue. . . .

We have been drawn into war against our will. No man can offer his hand more often than I have. But if they want to fight to exterminate the German nation, then they will get the surprise of their

lives. This time they will not meet a worn-out Germany, as in the Great War. They will encounter a Germany mobilized in the highest sense of the word, capable of fighting and determined to fight. If there are hopes to the contrary, I do not understand them. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1941; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 1, 1941)

Whining at an End

Altogether, I have not felt like whining since 1939. It is true, I was very sad before that, for I did everything to escape the war. Sven Hedin has just published a book in which he—and I am grateful he did so—quotes verbatim my offer to the Poles sent to the British. I must say I felt something like a shudder when I read through this offer again. And I cannot but thank Providence that it directed all these things in a different way, to thank it because of the things I have learned since; for, had this offer been accepted, then everything would have remained the same in Germany—we should have devoted ourselves to our social tasks, we should have worked, improved our cities, built workers' settlements, put our roads in order, instituted schools—we should have built up a real National Socialist State. Naturally we should then have probably spent very little on our armed forces. And then, one fine day, this tempest would have broken loose from the East, it would have swept across Poland and before we could have realized the danger it might have stood a mere 150 kilometers from Berlin. I owe this to those gentlemen who then rejected my offer. It is true that three years ago I myself had no inkling of that. Three years ago I was sad about it and, therefore, when the Polish campaign was over I wanted once more to offer my hand for peace—a peace which, after all, would not have cost my opponents anything. You know—it was rejected. I was then compelled to wage another, a second campaign, and I tried again in 1940 to offer my hand for peace—again it was rejected. From that moment the matter was settled for me. For each peace offer was interpreted as weakness by my opponents and therefore exploited against the German Reich. I would have disregarded my duties, therefore, had I tried anything of that kind again. I realized clearly—now only one thing remains. One state or rather one world must now fall—either our own or that other one. We will not fall; consequently, it is the other one that falls. . . .

We are making no more peace offers. The last one was made in 1940 and there is only one thing left now, and that is to fight. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1942; B.B.C.)

11

Assurances, Pledges, and Promises

When did the German people ever break its word?

Berlin, Nov. 11, 1933

I have never written a single line or made a single speech in which I have expressed an attitude contrary to my actions.

Berlin, April 28, 1939

The deceptive pledge and the false promise have been as much a part of Hitler's technique of treachery as the dreaded Stuka has been a part of Germany's military strategy.

The Fuehrer has not been handicapped by truth. He has said anything meeting the needs of the moment, regardless of any previous statement to the contrary. Whenever his program has called for the repudiation of a pledge, repudiation has followed in accordance with the same opportunistic policy which dictated the pledge.

The Nazis have asserted that statements made in one year do not necessarily apply in the next. But this is merely an excuse for Machiavellian politics. In Hitler's thinking, the end justifies any means. There is never a question of morality; success is the only standard of judgment.

When Hitler came to power he was compelled to mend Germany's diplomatic fences. It was no longer discreet to use the explosive language he had employed in the twenties. The situation in 1933 demanded caution and moderation. Gestures of conciliation and understanding were in order and Hitler proved equal to the occasion.

By and large, the majority of Hitler's post-1933 pledges and promises, duly scrapped at propitious moments, were diametrically opposed to statements he had made before 1933. Prior to his rise to power, he had insisted that Austria must some day be joined to Germany; yet he pledged his word to the contrary both in 1934 and 1935. His gestures toward Poland, after 1933, contrasted sharply with the wild revisionist propaganda energetically pursued in the Nazi press before 1933. And one need only compare the statements in the present chapter with the material in Chapter 4 to gauge the difference between Hitler the rabble-rouser and Hitler the Chancellor.

There are at least two major reasons why the lie has been an important weapon in Hitler's psychological warfare. The first is the obvious one of his unabashed Machiavellianism. The second lies in the dynamics of National Socialism, which, lacking a consistent ideological system, depends on an utterly unbridled use of opportunism and falsehood.

No Conquests, No Revenge, No Demands

We do not want foreign possessions, and we do not wish to incorporate foreign peoples. We do not want strife and quarrel. We want peace, but above all we love our German people. (Niederwald Memorial, Aug. 28, 1933; *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Aug. 29, 1933)

More perhaps than anyone else, National Socialist Germany clings to peace, because the National Socialist idea in domestic affairs depends upon a racial concept of statecraft which is determined by ties of blood, and, therefore, National Socialist Germany does not have an imperialistic policy of conquest abroad. Since we thus reject every policy of force, we should be and would be, on the other hand, just as determined to protect our own rights. (Berlin, Oct. 18, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 19, 1933)

We do not wish to oppress or subjugate other peoples, and thereby lose on the field of battle those who are of our own blood, in order to incorporate foreigners who would never love us. (Frankfurt-am-Main, Oct. 30, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 31, 1933)

The German people harbors no revenge; it does not desire conquests. The German people wants to extend the hand of reconciliation and understanding to every people. (Berlin, May 1, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 2, 1934)

Our love of peace is perhaps greater than that of the other nations, for we suffered most from this unhappy war. No one of us has the intention of threatening anyone. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

National Socialism does not harbor the slightest aggressive intent toward any European nation. (Nuremberg, Sept. 16, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 17, 1935)

We have no territorial demands to make in Europe. We know above all that the tension resulting from erroneous delimitation of territory, or from a disproportion between the populations and the space at their disposal cannot be solved through wars in Europe. But we also hope that human intelligence will help to alleviate the sufferings caused by these conditions and to remove tension by embarking upon a slow evolutionary development of peaceful cooperation. And particularly today more than ever before I am conscious of the necessity of honoring the obligations which our regained national honor

and freedom now impose upon us. These are obligations not only towards our own people but also towards the other European states. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

Germany has no desire for conquests in Europe. Germany does not have the intention of harming anyone in Europe. (Koenigsberg, March 18, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 20, 1936)

Germany makes no demands and presents no claims against other nations. (Breslau, March 22, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 24, 1936)

The National Socialist State has accepted very great sacrifices, indeed very great national sacrifices, for the sake of European peace. It has not cherished so-called thoughts of revenge, but on the contrary it has banished them from its entire public and private life. (Nuremberg, Sept. 12, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 13, 1938)

As a strong state we are at any time prepared to pursue a policy of understanding with our neighbors. We have no demands to make of them. (Saarbruecken, Oct. 9, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 10, 1938)

Germany has no intention of attacking other peoples. (Berlin, April 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 3, 1939)

Respect for Treaties and Obligations

No German Government will of its own accord break an agreement which cannot be removed without being replaced by a better one. (Berlin, May 17, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 18, 1933)

After the Saar question has been settled, the German Government will be ready to accept not only the letter but also the spirit of the Locarno Pact, for there will then be no other territorial question between France and Germany. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

Once in possession of absolute equality of rights, Germany will never refuse to participate in those efforts which are intended to serve the cause of human peace, progress and economic welfare. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

In view of the failure of the other states to fulfill their disarmament obligations, the German Government has for its part re-

nounced those articles of the Versailles Treaty which (because of the one-sided burden this laid on Germany was contrary to the provisions of the Treaty) have constituted a discrimination against Germany for an unlimited period of time. The German Government hereby most solemnly declares that its measures relate exclusively to the points which involve moral and material discrimination against the German people and of which notice has already been given. Germany will therefore unconditionally respect the articles concerning the mutual relations of the nations, including those articles which pertain to territorial provisions. Those revisions which will be inevitable in the course of time Germany will put into effect only through peaceful understanding. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

The German Government does not intend to sign any treaty which seems incapable of fulfillment; but it will unscrupulously observe every treaty voluntarily signed, even though concluded before its accession to power. In particular it will uphold and fulfill all obligations arising out of the Locarno Treaty, so long as the other partners are prepared to stand by that pact. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

The German Government is ready at any time to participate in a system of collective cooperation for safeguarding European peace, but regards it necessary to recognize the law of perpetual evolution by keeping open the way to treaty revision. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

The German Government is ready in principle to conclude pacts of non-aggression with neighbor states and to supplement these pacts with all provisions that aim at isolating the war-maker and localizing the area of the war. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

The German Government is ready to supplement the Locarno Treaty with an air agreement and to enter upon discussions regarding this matter. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

In its negotiations during the past years the German Government has always emphasized its willingness to abide by and fulfill all the obligations of the Locarno Pact so long as the other partners for their part are also prepared to stand by this treaty. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

With the achievement, at last, of Germany's equality of rights and the restoration of full sovereignty over the whole territory of the German Reich, the German Government regards the chief reason for its withdrawal from the League of Nations as eliminated. Germany is therefore prepared to enter the League of Nations again. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

I have never left any doubt, as I have already emphasized, that even a revision of the Treaty of Versailles would also have to have its limits. And I have always said so with the utmost frankness—not for any tactical reasons but from my innermost conviction. As the national leader of the German people I have never left any doubt that wherever the higher interests of the European system were at stake, national interests must, if necessary, be relegated to second place in certain cases. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

Respect for Peace

All of us who once learned to know war realize that the aim of politics cannot be that of carrying on war. . . . Peace will never be broken by us. . . . We will never break the peace. (Berlin, May 16, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 17, 1934)

Germany will never break the peace of Europe. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

We are not interested in breaking peace. (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 27, 1938)

No Intentions Against Austria

The assertion that it is the intention of the German Reich to coerce the Austrian State is absurd and cannot in any way be substantiated or proved. . . .

I must denounce most emphatically the further assertion of the Austrian Government that some sort of an attack on the part of the Reich against the Austrian State will be undertaken or is even planned. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

Germany neither intends nor wishes to interfere in the internal affairs of Austria, to annex Austria, or to unite with Austria. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

Genuine Friendship for Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia is a state which has increasingly attracted the attention of our people since the war. The high regard which the German soldiers then felt for this brave people has since been deepened and has developed into genuine friendship. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Immediately after the *Anschluss*, I informed Yugoslavia that the frontier in common with that country would henceforth be regarded as unalterable by Germany and that we wished to live with her in peace and friendship. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

No Demands Against Scandinavian States

I have given binding declarations to a number of states. None of these can complain that even a trace of a demand contrary thereto has ever been made to them by Germany. None of the Scandinavian statesmen, for example, can contend that the German Government or that German public opinion has ever made a demand which was incompatible with the sovereignty and integrity of their state. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

Germany has taken no steps in regard to the German territory handed over to Denmark under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles; she has on the contrary established loyal and friendly relations with Denmark. We have made no demands for revision, but we have concluded a non-aggression pact with Denmark. Our relations with that country are thus directed towards unswervingly loyal and friendly cooperation. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

Germany has concluded non-aggression pacts with the Baltic states. Her interests there are of an exclusively economic nature. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

Germany never at any time had any conflicting interests, much less points of controversy, with the Northern States, and she has none today. Sweden and Norway were both offered non-aggression pacts by Germany; these were refused because they did not feel in any way threatened. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

Guarantees to the Western Nations

The German Government has assured Belgium and Holland that it is ready to recognize and to guarantee these states as neutral regions in perpetuity. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1937)

Germany today has completely satisfactory frontiers on many sides, and she is determined and has promised to accede to and accept these borders henceforth as unchangeable and definite, in order thereby to give Europe a feeling of security and peace. (Nuremberg, Sept. 12, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 13, 1938)

We have given guarantees to the states in the West and have guaranteed to all contiguous neighbors the inviolability of their territory as far as Germany is concerned. That is not a phrase; that is our sacred will. (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 27, 1938)

I have given my assurance that the boundary between France and Germany is final. . . . Germany has no interests in the West. Our western line of fortifications is the boundary line of the Reich for all time. Moreover, we have no aspirations for the future and this attitude of ours will remain unchanged. (Berlin, Sept. 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 2, 1939)

The neutral states have assured us of their neutrality in the same way that we have already guaranteed ours to them. We are in deadly earnest with this assurance and as long as no one else violates their neutrality we shall likewise scrupulously observe it. What indeed could we wish or desire from them? (Berlin, Sept. 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 2, 1939)

The New Reich has endeavored to continue the traditional friendship with Holland; it did not take over any differences between the two states; nor did it create new ones. . . . Immediately after I had taken over the government, I tried to establish friendly relations with Belgium. I renounced any revision as well as any desire for revision. The Reich has put forward no claim which might be regarded as a threat to Belgium. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

Friendship Between England and Germany

The German Government recognizes the all-embracing and vital importance, and therewith the justification, of unqualified protection for the British Empire on the high seas. On the other hand we are as much resolved to do all that is necessary for the protection of our continental existence and freedom. The German Government honestly intends to find and to maintain that relationship with the British people and state which will prevent for all time to come a repetition of the only struggle that has ever occurred between the two nations. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

I have . . . extended a hand to England. I renounced voluntarily ever again entering into naval competition, so as to give the British Empire a feeling of security. I did not do this because I could not build more—and there should be no illusion about that—but exclusively for this reason: To insure a permanent peace between both nations. To be sure, there is here one prerequisite. It will not do that one party says, I never again want to conduct a war and therefore I voluntarily offer to cut my armaments down to thirty-five per cent; and that the other party says, if it suits us we will fight again from time to time. That will not do! Such an agreement is morally justified only if both peoples shake hands on a promise never to wage war upon each other again. Germany has this desire! We all hope that among the English people those will prevail who are of the same mind. (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 26, 1938)

I have stated over and over again that there is no German and above all no National Socialist who, even in his most secret thoughts, has the intention of causing the British Empire any kind of difficulties. From England, too, the voices of men who think reasonably and calmly express a similar attitude with regard to Germany. It would be a blessing for the whole world if mutual confidence and cooperation could be established between the two peoples. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

During the whole of my political activity I have always expounded the idea of close friendship and collaboration between Germany and England. In my Movement I have found countless others with the same point of view. Perhaps they joined me because of my attitude in this regard. This desire for Anglo-German friendship and cooperation conforms not only to sentiments based on the racial origins of our

two peoples but also to my realization of the importance of the existence of the British Empire for the whole of mankind.

I have never left any doubt of my belief that the existence of this Empire is a factor of inestimable value for the whole of human culture and economic life. By whatever means Great Britain has acquired her colonial territories—and I know that they were those of force and often brutality—I know full well that no other empire has ever come into being in any other way. I know, too, that in the final analysis, it is not so much the methods that are taken into account in history, as success, and not the success of the methods as such, but rather the general good which the methods yield. There is no doubt that the Anglo-Saxon people have made immeasurable contributions in the work of world colonization. For this work I have sincere admiration. The thought of destroying this labor appeared and still appears to me, from the higher viewpoint of humanity, as nothing but a manifestation of wanton human destructiveness. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

I have offered England our friendship over and over again, and if the occasion demands, closest cooperation. But friendship cannot be merely one-sided. It must find a response from the other side. (Berlin, Sept. 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 2, 1939)

German-Polish Amity

Germans and Poles will have to become reconciled to the fact that the two nations exist. Hence it is more sensible to regulate this state of affairs, which the last thousand years has not been able to remove and the next thousand years will not be able to remove either, in such a way that the highest possible profit will accrue from it for both nations. It also seemed imperative to me to show by means of a concrete example that existing differences should not be allowed to interfere with that form of mutual intercourse which could promote the peace and prosperity of both nations; this rather than the political and economic paralysis which must inevitably result from a permanent state of mutual distrust.

Furthermore, it seemed to me right in this case to deal with the problems affecting both countries by means of a frank and open exchange of views between the two nations themselves, rather than go on entrusting third and fourth parties with this task. Moreover, whatever the differences between the two countries in the future may be,

the catastrophic effects of the attempt to remove them through warlike action would far outweigh any possible advantage gained. The German Government, therefore, happy to find the leader of the present Polish state, Marshal Pilsudski, equally broadminded, incorporated this mutual recognition in a treaty* which will not only be of equal advantage to the Polish and German peoples, but which will also substantially contribute to the maintenance of general peace. In the spirit of this treaty the German Government is willing and prepared to cultivate economic relations with Poland in such a way that here too the state of unprofitable restraint can be succeeded by a period of useful cooperation. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

Without taking the past into account, Germany has concluded a non-aggression pact with Poland. This is more than a valuable contribution to European peace, and we shall adhere to it unconditionally. We only hope that it will be renewed and continued uninterruptedly and that it will deepen the friendly relations between the two countries. . . . With the understanding and heartfelt friendship of genuine nationalists, we recognize Poland as the home of a great and nationally conscious people. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

We feel it unpleasant for instance that access to the sea, accorded to a nation of 33,000,000 should cut through former territory of the Reich; but we recognize that is unreasonable, because it is impossible to deny so large a state an approach to the sea. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

We are glad to be able to state now in the fifth year after the first great foreign political agreement of the Reich that in our relationship with the state from which we might have expected the greatest opposition, not only has tension been lessened, but during this year there has been a pronounced rapprochement. Of course I realize that we have a certain circumstance to thank for this—the circumstance that there was then no western parliamentarianism in Warsaw, but rather a Polish Marshal, an outstanding character, who realized the importance to Europe of relieving this tension. That work, regarded at the time with skepticism by many people, has endured the test of time, and I may well say that from the moment that the League of

*The German-Polish Pact of Jan. 26, 1934.

Nations finally gave up its continual attempts at disturbing affairs in Danzig and appointed a new commissioner, a man of high personal qualities, that danger spot in Europe lost its threatening aspect entirely. The Polish State respects the national regulations of Danzig, and Danzig and Germany respect Polish rights. It was possible to find the way to an understanding in spite of attempts to disturb it, and, beginning with Danzig, to remove differences between Germany and Poland, thus creating a sincere spirit of friendly cooperation. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

The hardest problem I found was in Polish-German relations. The danger existed that in this case an idea of inherited enmity would gain possession of our people as well as of the Polish people. This I wanted to forestall. I know perfectly well that I would not have succeeded if at that time Poland had had a democratic constitution. For these democracies dripping with peace phrases are the most bloodthirsty war agitators. There was no democracy in Poland but there was a man. We succeeded in less than a year in arriving at an agreement with him which for the duration of ten years basically removed the danger of any clash. We are all convinced that this agreement will bring about lasting pacification. We realize that here are two nations that must live side by side, neither one of which can eliminate the other. A state of 33,000,000 people will always strive for an outlet to the sea. The road to an understanding had to be found. It was found and is being ever more expanded. The deciding factor is that the two administrations and all sensible and reasonable people in both countries have a firm resolve to improve relations further. (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 27, 1938)

We have just celebrated the fifth anniversary of our non-aggression pact with Poland. There can scarcely be any difference of opinion today among the true friends of peace with regard to the value of this agreement. One only needs to ask oneself what might have happened to Europe if this agreement which brought such relief had not been entered into five years ago. In signing it the great Polish Marshal and patriot rendered his people just as great a service as the leader of the National Socialist State rendered the German people. During the troubled months of the past year the friendship between Germany and Poland was one of the reassuring factors in the political life of Europe. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Nothing From France, Absolutely Nothing

The world doubts our love of peace. For when we make declarations for peace, they say again "One cannot trust these declarations; we demand proofs." If we then ask what proofs they want, they say that France feels herself threatened. Well and good! Before the entire world I declare: We are ready to offer the French people the hand of reconciliation. (Berlin, Oct. 24, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 26, 1933)

France fears for her security. No one in Germany wishes to threaten it and we are ready to do everything to prove this. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

The problem of the Saar is still the object of controversy between France and Germany. We do not want to give up the hope that when this question is once settled, perhaps on the other side, too, there will develop a willingness to see problems as they are and to conclude a sincere peace with us. The question of the Saar is the only territorial question which still separates us from France. After its solution there will be no logical reason why two great nations should eternally feud with one another for all future time. (Coblenz, Aug. 26, 1934; *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Aug. 28, 1934)

When I, as the *Fuehrer* and representative of the German nation, gave to the world and to my own people the assurance that with the settlement of the question of the Saar no further territorial demands would be made on France, that was a contribution to peace much greater than many a signature under many a pact. . . . Germany has solemnly recognized and guaranteed France her frontiers as determined after the Saar plebiscite. . . . We did all this although we thereby finally renounced, for instance, all claims to Alsace Lorraine, a land for which we have also fought two great wars. But we did it in particular to spare our own German nation a new and terrible sacrifice of lives. We are convinced that in so doing we are benefiting not only our own people, but also this frontier territory. We are prepared to do everything on our part to arrive at a true peace and a real friendship with the French people. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

In these three years I have tried again and again—unfortunately too often in vain—to build a bridge of understanding across to the people of France. The further we become removed from the bitterness

of the World War and the years that followed it, the more do evil memories fade from the minds of men and the more do the beautiful aspects of life and knowledge and experience come to the fore. Those who once faced one another as bitter opponents, honor each other today as men who fought bravely in a great struggle and regard each other as the bearers and trustees of a great and common cultural inheritance.

Why then is it not possible to put an end to this useless quarrel which has lasted for centuries and which has never been and never will be decisively settled by either of the two nations? Why not replace it by the rule of higher reason? The German people have no interest in seeing the French people suffer. On the other hand, what advantage can come to France if Germany succumbs to misery? What good can the French peasant expect when times are bad with the German peasant, or vice versa? Of what advantage can the French worker expect from the distress of the German worker? What blessing could it bring to Germany, to the German laborer and to the German middle classes or the whole of the German people, if France were overwhelmed with misfortune? . . .

I have expurgated from the German press all expressions of hatred against the French people. I have labored to instil in our youth an appreciation for the ideal of such an understanding. This has not been without success. A few weeks ago, when our French guests marched into the Olympic Stadium at Garmisch-Partenkirchen, they may have taken the occasion of noticing whether and how far I had succeeded in bringing about such a change in the German people. . . .

On February 21st, a French journalist approached me with the request to grant him an interview. As I was informed that he was one of those Frenchmen who try just as hard as we do to find a way towards an understanding between the two nations, I did not like to refuse him, especially as my refusal might immediately be interpreted as a sign of disrespect towards French journalism. I gave him the information he desired, just as I had given it hundreds and thousands of times in Germany, and I tried once more to approach the French people with the request for an understanding which we want with all our hearts, and which we so gladly would like to see carried into effect. (March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

I should be prepared at any time to enter into an accord with the French Government. We call upon both nations. I place this question before the German people: German people, do you at last want to

bury the hatchet of war that has existed between France and us, and do you want peace and understanding to enter in? If you want that, then say Yes. And then the same question shall also be posed to the other side—to the French people. And I do not doubt that the French people want understanding just as much as we, that they want conciliation just as much as we. Then I shall further ask the German people: Do you want us to oppress the French people or to give them fewer rights than we have? And they will say: No, we do not want that. Then the German people shall likewise ask the French people whether they want the German people to have fewer rights in their own country as another people in theirs. I am convinced that the French people will say: No! We do not want that. (Frankfurt-am-Main, March 16, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 18, 1936)

Germany has steadily given her assurance, and I solemnly repeat this assurance here, that between ourselves and France, for example, there are no grounds for quarrel that are humanly thinkable. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1937)

Germany has no further territory in Europe to claim from France, a point I have frequently stressed. We hope the regaining of the Saar districts has now definitely closed the chapter of Franco-German territorial disputes. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

In the course of the seventeenth century France gradually took Alsace and Lorraine from the old German Reich in the midst of the deepest peace. In 1870-71, after a hard war that had been forced upon her, Germany demanded these territories back and obtained them. After the World War they were lost again. The cathedral of Strassburg meant a great deal to us Germans. In spite of that, when we finally decided to renounce it, it was for the purpose of serving the cause of European peace in the future. Nobody could have forced us to give up these claims for revision if we had not wanted once and for all to end this eternal dispute with France. (Nuremberg, Sept. 12, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 13, 1938)

Immediately after the Saar had been returned to the Reich by plebiscite, I told France there were absolutely no further differences between France and us. I said: The question of Alsace-Lorraine does not exist for us any more. That is a border region. The people of this region really have not been asked their opinion in the last few decades. We believe that the inhabitants of this province will be happiest if

they are no longer the occasion for war. None of us desires war with France. We want nothing of France, absolutely nothing. When the Saar territory was returned to the Reich, thanks to—let me confirm it here—thanks to France's loyal execution of the treaties, I immediately gave this solemn assurance. Henceforth, all the territorial differences between France and Germany are settled. Today I can see no disagreement at all between us. Here are two great nations that both want to work and live. They can best live if they work together. (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 27, 1938)

I have not described the cession of Alsace-Lorraine as intolerable for the future, as France did in 1870-71, but I have here drawn a difference between the Saar territory and these two former imperial provinces. I have never changed my viewpoint in this respect, nor will I ever do so. I have not allowed this view to be modified or jeopardized inside the country on any occasion, either in the press or in any other way. The return of the Saar territory has done away with all territorial problems in Europe between France and Germany. I have, however, always regarded it as regrettable that French statesmen should take this attitude for granted.

This is, however, not the way to look at the matter. It was not for fear of France that I preached this attitude. As a former soldier, I see no reason whatever for such fear. Moreover, as regards the Saar territory I made it quite clear that we would not countenance any refusal to return it to Germany. No, I have confirmed this attitude to France as an expression of appreciation of the necessity to attain peace in Europe, instead of sowing the seed of continual uncertainty and even tension by making unlimited demands and continually asking for revision. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

My chief endeavor has been to rid our relations with France of all venom and to make these relations tolerable for both nations. I once set forth with the utmost clarity and precision Germany's claims, and I have never gone back on that declaration. The return of the Saar territory was the one demand which I regarded as an indispensable prerequisite for a Franco-German understanding. After France herself had found a just solution to this problem, Germany had no further claims against France. No such claim exists any longer, and no such claim shall ever be put forward. That is to say, I have refused even to mention the problem of Alsace-Lorraine, not because I was forced to keep silence, but because this matter does not constitute a problem

which could ever interfere in Franco-German relations. I accepted the decision made in 1919 and refused to consider ever again embarking upon a war for the sake of a question which has no relation to Germany's vital interests, but which would easily involve every second generation in tragic warfare. France realizes this. It is impossible for any French statesman to stand up and declare that I have ever made any demand upon France, the fulfillment of which would have been incompatible with French honor or French interests. It is, however, true, that instead of such a demand I have always expressed to France my desire to bury forever our ancient enmity, and to permit these two nations, both of which have such a great historical past, to find the way to each other. Among the German people I have done my utmost to eradicate the idea of an everlasting hereditary enmity and to inculcate in its stead respect for the great achievements of the French nation and for its history, as every German soldier has the greatest respect for the feats of the French Army. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

12

Versailles is to Blame

Because of hunger our spirits are numb, and we get ever deeper into the clutches of Entente capital. These are the results of the Peace Treaty of Versailles.

Munich, April 21, 1922

The Peace Treaty is intolerable. Its economic fulfillment necessarily means political slavery, and its political fulfillment means economic slavery. The abolition of this treaty, therefore, is a necessity.

Munich, April 20, 1923

None of Hitler's oratorical offensives surpass his attacks on the Treaty of Versailles. It has been his never-ending thesis that the treaty was formulated in a spirit of revenge by the "democratic peace dictators" of Europe and America. He has never tired of claiming that the treaty violated ancient historical traditions, increased tension among nations, and destroyed the whole structure of German economy.

Few will deny that Germany had legitimate grievances arising out of the peace settlement. But Hitler's campaign against the Treaty of Versailles can hardly be regarded as based upon objective historical judgment. The peace had imperfections, but it also embodied constructive provisions. True, self-determination was denied the Germans in Austria and the Sudetenland; yet Versailles honored that principle more generously than any other European settlement. As for severity, the treaty was a shining light compared with the peace of Brest-Litovsk which Germany forced upon the Russians in March, 1918.

Biased and unsound as are Hitler's assertions concerning the peace, there is shrewd reason for his one-sided emphasis. By making the treaty the scapegoat of Germany's suffering, he has led the German people to the false conclusion that once it was blotted out their problems would be solved. By insisting that the treaty was an international outrage, he exploited for his own ends the latent sympathy outside Germany for revision of the document. (His mistake in assigning all the world's ills to Versailles and his omission of the fundamentally more important effects of the war itself have been made abundantly clear by Professor James T. Shotwell.)

The Fuehrer has not, of course, been so much concerned with the "injustices" of the "Diktat" as with exploiting their propaganda possibilities for his own purposes. In 1939, he completely invalidated the German case against the treaty when he seized Czechoslovakia. After that act, it became tragically evident that he did not believe in national "equality" but, rather, in the brutal principles he had enunciated so vehemently before 1933.

A World in Chaos

All of the problems which are causing such unrest today lie in the deficiencies of the Treaty of Peace that failed to solve in a clear and reasonable way the questions of that time which, as far as the future was concerned, were of the most vital importance. Neither the national nor the economic—to say nothing of the legal—problems and demands of the nations were settled by this treaty in such a way as to stand the criticism of reason in the future. It is therefore comprehensible that the idea of revision is not only one of the accompanying phenomenon of the effects of this treaty, but that it was actually foreseen as necessary by the authors of the treaty and therefore given a legal foundation in the treaty itself. If I deal briefly with the problems which the treaty should have settled, it is because its failure in this respect has inevitably given rise to the later situations under which the political and economic relations of nations have since been suffering.

The political problems are the following. For centuries the European states and their frontiers developed from conceptions which lay only in the realm of pure political thought. With the triumph of the national concept and the principle of nationality in the course of the last century, the seed of many conflicts was sown by the fact that those states which had come into existence under other conditions failed to take these new ideas and ideals into account. At the end of the World War there could have been no nobler task for a real peace conference than to undertake—in the clear recognition of this fact—a territorial and political reorganization of the European states which, to the greatest extent possible, would have done justice to this principle. The more such a settlement succeeded in making the frontiers between peoples coincide with the frontiers between states, the more it would have eliminated a whole series of potential conflicts. Indeed, such a territorial reorganization of Europe, in taking into account the real and historical frontiers between peoples, would have been a far-sighted solution which would perhaps have made the sacrifice of life during the Great War appear to conquerors and conquered alike as not entirely in vain, because it would have given the world a basis for a real and lasting peace. As it was, through ignorance, passion, and hatred, decisions were taken which, in their injustice and lack of logic, bore the seeds of new conflicts.

The following were the economic problems which awaited solution at the peace conference. The present economic situation of the Conti-

ment is characterized by overpopulation in western Europe and by the poverty of its soil in certain raw materials which are essential to the standard of life which has grown up in these territories with their ancient culture. If the statesmen at Versailles wanted to bring lasting peace to Europe, they should have recognized and followed (instead of the dangerous and sterile conceptions of expiation, punishment, and reparation) the profound truth that the lack of the necessities of life has always been a source of conflict between peoples. Instead of preaching the idea of extermination, they should have embarked upon a reorganization of international political and economic relationships, so as to do justice, to the fullest possible extent, to the vital needs of each nation.

It is not wise to deprive a people of the economic resources necessary for its existence without taking into consideration the fact that the population is dependent on its resources and will have to continue to live in those regions. The idea that the economic extermination of 65,000,000 would be of service to other nations is absurd. Any people inclined to follow such a line of thought would, under the law of cause and effect, soon discover that the doom which they were preparing for another nation very soon overtake them. The idea of reparations and the way in which they were enforced will some day become a classic example in the history of the nations of how damaging indifference to international welfare can be to all.

As a matter of fact, reparations could only be financed by German exports. In the same measure that Germany, because of reparations, was regarded as an international export factor, so the export trade of the creditor nations was bound to suffer. The economic benefit accruing from Germany's reparation payments could, therefore, never make good the damage which the system of reparations inflicted upon the individual economic systems. The attempt to prevent such a development by compensating for a limitation of German exports through the grant of credits, in order to render payments possible, was no less shortsighted and in the end a mistake. For the conversion of political debts into private obligations led to an interest service which was bound to have the same results. The worst feature, however, was that the development of internal economic life was artificially hindered and ruined. The struggle in the world's raw material markets by constant underselling led to excessive rationalization measures in the economic field. The millions of German unemployed are the final result of this development. If it was desired, however, to restrict reparation obligations to deliveries in kind, this would have caused equally

serious damage to the internal production of the nations receiving them. For deliveries in kind to the amount involved are unthinkable without most seriously endangering the production of the individual nations.

The Treaty of Versailles is to blame for having inaugurated a period in which financial calculations appear to destroy economic reason. Germany faithfully fulfilled the obligations imposed upon her, in spite of their intrinsic lack of reason and the obviously suicidal consequences of this fulfillment. The international economic crisis is the indisputable proof of the correctness of this statement. The chance of restoring a general international sentiment for legality has also been no less destroyed by the treaty. For, in order to justify all the measures of this edict, Germany had to be branded as the guilty party. This procedure is, indeed, just as simple as it is inadmissible. In the future the vanquished will again bear the guilt of any conflicts, for to the victor there always remains the possibility of simply forcing this verdict.

This procedure therefore assumes a terrible significance, because it gave an excuse for the conversion of the power relationship which existed at the end of the war into a permanent legal status. The concept of the victor and the vanquished thus literally became the basis of a new international legal and social order. The degradation of a great people to a nation of second rank was proclaimed at the same moment that a League of Nations came into being. This treatment of Germany could not lead to the pacification of the world. The demobilization and disarming of the vanquished which was thus considered necessary—an unheard-of procedure in the history of the European nations—was still less calculated to diminish general dangers and conflicts. It merely led, however, to that state of general threats, demands, and sanctions which, because of the disquietude and insecurity it engendered, threatened the entire economic structure of the world. If in the life of nations the consideration of risk is omitted from certain negotiations, then unreason may all too easily triumph over reason. At any rate, up to the present, the League of Nations has been unable to grant any appreciable assistance to the weak and unarmed in such cases. Treaties which are concluded between nations for their mutual pacification possess an inner meaning only if they are based upon the idea of real and honest equality for all. Therein lies the main reason for the state of unrest which for years has gripped the world. . . .

Millions of shattered lives, the ruin of entire professions, and an enormous army of unemployed—all these facts reflect a state of wretch-

edness the extent of which I should like to impress on the rest of the world by one single figure. Since the signature of this treaty, which was to form the foundation stone of a new and better world for all nations, 224,900 people—men, women, old people, and children—have taken their own lives, almost exclusively out of distress and misery. These incorruptible witnesses condemn the spirit and fulfillment of a treaty from which not only the rest of the world but also millions of people in Germany expected salvation and peace. May the other nations realize the resolute will of Germany to put an end to a period of human blundering and to find the way to a final understanding between all, on the basis of equal rights. (Berlin, May 17, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 18, 1933)

At the Brink of Bolshevism

When the treaty was concluded, it was forgotten that the world could not be reconstructed by the slave-work of a violated nation but only by the trustful cooperation of all, and that for this end the primary necessity was the destruction of the war psychosis. It is clear that the problematical question of war-guilt cannot be historically settled by the victors by compelling the vanquished to sign a confession of their guilt. The ultimate war-guilt can surely best be seen from the contents of the dictated treaty itself.

The German nation is profoundly convinced that it had no responsibility for the outbreak of the war. The other participants in this tragic misfortune probably have the same conviction. How much more necessary is it then, because of such a general conviction of innocence on the part of everyone, that a permanent feeling of enmity should not arise, and that the remembrance of this catastrophe should not serve the artificial cultivation of such a feeling. The unnatural perpetuation of the terms "victor" and "vanquished" must not be allowed to give rise to a permanent inequality which fills the one with understandable conceit and the other with an ineradicable bitterness.

It is no mere matter of chance that after such a long and artificial affliction of mankind, certain consequences make their appearance. The shocking decay of economic life was followed by a no less threatening political decay. What was the sense of the World War if it procured not only for the vanquished but also for the victors nothing but a series of economic catastrophes? The welfare of nations has not increased and their political fortunes as well as human contentment have really not undergone any profound change for the better. Armies of

unemployed developed into a new estate in society, and just as the economic structures of the nations have been shaken to their very foundations, so have alarming fissures begun to appear in the social structures.

It was Germany that had to suffer most from these consequences of the treaty, and the general insecurity which has arisen therefrom. The unemployment figure rose to a third of the number normally employed in the nation. That means, however, that in Germany, with a population of 65,000,000, counting the families of the unemployed, 20,000,000 people had not only no subsistence, but a hopeless future stared them in the face. It was only a question of time when this army of economic outcasts would have become an army of fanatics politically and socially estranged from the world.

One of the oldest cultural nations in the modern civilized world stood, with 6,000,000 Communists, on the brink of a catastrophe to which only the stupid could be blind. If the Red Revolution had overswept Germany like a firebrand, then the cultural countries of western Europe would have soon learned that it was not a matter of indifference to them whether on the Rhine and on the North Sea a spiritually revolutionary and expanding Asiatic power stood watch, or the peaceful German peasants and working men who in genuine comradeship with the other nations of our European culture wished only to earn their daily bread by honest labor. In saving Germany from this threatening catastrophe, the National Socialist Movement saved not only the German nation but also did a historical service to the whole of Europe. (Berlin, Oct. 14, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 15/16, 1933)

A Vindictive Peace

A peace was established without regard for reality, indeed even without regard for the most primitive intelligence, a peace which was attended by a single thought: How can one suppress the vanquished, how can one deprive the defeated of all honor, how can one brand him for all eternity as the guilty one. It was a peace which was not peace, but which inevitably must lead to the perpetuation of hatred between nations.

There were 440 paragraphs, the majority of which bring the blush of shame to our faces when we read them—a peace which is not to be compared with similar ones of former times. May I refer to the fact that in the year 1870 no one could have any doubt about the cause

of war at that time, and thus no doubt about the war guilt. And just as much one could not doubt that at that time we were the victors. But what did Germany impose on the vanquished? The loss of a region which at one time was of German origin, a financial burden which had no relation to the wealth of the enemy of that time nor to his natural wealth, a burden which was completely disposed of in scarcely three years. Moreover, there was not a single clause offensive to the honor of that people, nothing at all which might have burdened the future of that people in any way, no hindrance to their own development, to their own life, to their opportunities, to their abilities, not the slightest attempt to limit their army in the future. No, nothing of all that. After three years France was really completely free.

The last peace, however, was not at all to be measured with the yardstick of reason. What connection is there with reason if the world on the one hand cannot do away with the fact that here exists a nation of 65,000,000 persons and on the other hand deprives it of the possibility of life. The Peace Treaty is based on the gross error that the misfortune of one nation must be the good fortune of another, on the error that the economic plight of one nation would bring economic well-being to another. . . .

This peace, which was supposed to cure the world of all its suffering, this peace which should finally bring reason to the world, which should give human beings life and bread for life, this peace has in reality plunged the world into immeasurable misery. Armies of millions of unemployed are the living witnesses of the folly of those who concluded these treaties. A higher justice prevails here, which has now avenged this folly on all, not only on the vanquished, but also on the victors. There is no more devastating judgment of this Peace Treaty than the fact that it has not only plunged the vanquished into boundless misfortune, but it has also brought no advantage to the victors. One cannot establish a permanent world order upon the idea of hatred. One cannot construct in Europe a permanent community of nations which are not equal. In the long run such a situation is intolerable and must lead to the disruption of such a community. It is not to be contested that after more than thirteen years this Peace Treaty has brought no peace to Europe, but eternal unrest, disquietude, distrust, hatred, uncertainty, and despair.

In the same manner that the Powers negotiated thoughtlessly in the economic realm they negotiated thoughtlessly in political matters. Just one isolated example. The Corridor was established between Poland and Germany. Another solution could have been found at that

time. There are Germans in Europe and there are Poles in Europe. The two nations will have to accustom themselves to living beside one another and with one another and to get along. The Poles cannot wish the German people off the map of Europe, and we are still sensible enough not to wish the Poles away. We know that both nations are here, they must live with one another. Why, then, did the Powers place a bone of contention in their lives? The Powers could have done anything at that time. Why did they have to do what they did? Only in order to perpetuate hatred, only in order to plunge nations which would otherwise get along together into dissension. It really would have been possible to find another solution in order that both nations could have been granted justice. But indeed the Powers did not want that. In every way the thought underlying this peace was: How can one artificially maintain this unrest in the future. . . .?

The greatest horrors have occurred in Germany in the name of the Peace Treaty of Versailles. Because of the Peace Treaty of Versailles about 20,000 human beings have committed suicide annually and they were decent persons, decent human beings who could live no longer because this treaty destroyed all prospects and opportunities in life for them. (Berlin, Oct. 24, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 26, 1933)

Victor and Vanquished

Through its attempt to make the balance of power existing at the end of the war the basis of a system of international justice for all time, the treaty perpetuated hatred on the one side and grim embitterment on the other. Rejecting past human experience and the protests of wise counsellors, the victors believed that the future could be better served by burdening it with the curses of the past. Only from this explanation can it be understood that even after mankind received this most difficult of lessons, no true peace but only a state of increased unrest followed the Peace Treaty.

The senseless political and economic burdens imposed by this treaty have destroyed the confidence of the German people in the ultimate justice of this world. But in the case of many millions of people it inevitably fanned the feelings of hatred against a world order which made possible permanent defamation of and discrimination against a great people merely because they had the misfortune, after heroic resistance, to lose a war which was forced upon them.

The wire-pullers of the Communist Revolution at once recognized

the unprecedented possibilities which arose out of this treaty and the practical effects involved for the revolutionization of the German people. In that the Communist Party took up the fight against the Treaty of Versailles, it succeeded in mobilizing men who, in the depths of their despair, believed that the only way out was to be found in chaos. But the world did not seem to notice that, while it blindly insisted upon the literal fulfillment of unintelligible and indeed absolutely insane impossibilities, a development was taking place in Germany which, as the prelude to the Communist world revolution, was bound within a short time to lead to the so-called victor Powers finding themselves faced not by a profitable treaty-slave but by a pestiferous bacillus carrier. . . .

One of the worst results of the Peace Treaty of Versailles is that it perpetuated the concept of victor and vanquished. Thus, it necessarily brought about the danger of perpetuating the idea that differences of opinion and interests in international life must either not be voiced by the weaker party at all or must be answered with brute force by the stronger party. The idea that by means of sanctions one has the right to heap new injustices upon nations already deprived of their rights cannot but lead to terrible disruptions in international life. Experience has shown that the humble submissiveness of the vanquished appeases the victors less and less, but rather incites them to new encroachments.

For fourteen years the German people endeavored, by pursuing a suicidal policy of fulfillment, to propitiate irreconcilable enemies and to contribute to the establishment of a new European community of states. The results were profoundly tragic. The fact that concessions were made in regard to reparations does not prove the contrary. It was only after the ruin not only of German economy but also to a large extent of world economy that it was decided to terminate by agreement a procedure which as a matter of fact had already reached a dead end because of Germany's complete destitution. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

Intolerable Peace Terms

After a war which had lasted for four years and had already done untold damage to the national resources, the victorious Powers imposed upon the German nation a peace dictate devoid of all political and economic reason and which aimed at making the relation of forces that existed at the end of the war the legal basis for the life of the

nations for all time. Without considering the conditions and laws that govern economic life, and even in direct contradiction to them, the victorious Powers deprived Germany of every possibility of an economic revival while demanding on the other hand payments and services which lay within the realm of the fantastic. The edifice of German economics was razed to the ground under the watchword "Reparations." This incomprehensible disregard for the most elementary economic laws resulted in the following situation: First, the nation had a surplus of workers; second, the nation was in urgent need of something to replace the values pertaining to the high standard of life to which it had been accustomed and which had been destroyed by the war, the inflation, and reparations; third, the nation suffered from a lack of natural resources of foodstuffs and raw materials; fourth, the international market which it needed in order to overcome all these evils was too small and was further increasingly limited in practice by various measures and by a certain inevitable trend in developments.

It is a very poor testimony to the economic sense of those who were then our political opponents that until their action had not only completely destroyed German economy but had begun to show its ill effects in the economic life of other countries they did not begin to see that it was impossible for us to fulfill unlimited and sometimes incomprehensible demands. The result of this madness was that German industry was paralyzed, agriculture was destroyed, the middle classes were ruined, trade had shrunk to almost nothing, the whole economic life was overladen with debt, the public finances were rotten to the core and there were six and a half million unemployed on the register—in reality more than seven and a half millions. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

War Tensions

That peace which was to have been the final stone over the tomb of the war became the dragon seeds of new conflicts. Since that time, no matter where we may have turned our eyes, we have experienced the spectacle of domestic discord and foreign strife. Not a year has passed since then but that somewhere upon this earth the clashing of arms is heard instead of the chimes of peace. Can one but wonder that from such tragic disillusionment there results within the nations a shattering of confidence in the justice of the world order which has manifestly failed in such a catastrophic way? New ideas struggle for the mastery of mankind and send out those whom they convert as cru-

saders for new conquests. World history will one day record that since the end of the Great War the earth has been a prey to mental, political, and economic revolutions such as ordinarily occur only once within a thousand years and such as impress upon peoples and continents their special meaning and character. Just consider that since then the tension between the nations has become greater than ever before. . . .

This development originated with that unhappy treaty which will one day stand in history as a work of human shortsightedness and unreasonable passion, as a classic example of how not to end a war, if new upheavals are not to be brought upon the nations. On account of its close connection with the constitution of the community of nations, the spirit of this treaty has been a burden to the League of Nations and therewith has made the League ineffective. Since that time a distinction has been made between those nations that have been ranged on the one side by the Peace Treaty as the vanquished—which have no rights—and those ranged on the other side as the victors, which alone have rights. This arrangement is contrary to the idea of the League of Nations, which should be a community of free and equal peoples. Out of the spiritual atmosphere of this treaty there further ensued shortsighted treatment of numerous political and economic questions of the world. National frontiers were not drawn according to the clear necessities of life or with regard to established traditions, but were inspired by the spirit of revenge and retribution. These frontiers became the source of new fears and anxieties because of the fact that they might awaken thoughts of revenge. There was a time when statesmen had the opportunity to introduce a spirit of brotherly understanding among the nations by an appeal to the intelligence and to the soul of millions of ex-soldiers in the belligerent countries. This might have brought unmeasured relief to international relations and inaugurated such collaboration as could have endured for centuries. But the very opposite happened. And the worst of all was that the spirit of hatred inherent in this treaty became part and parcel of the general mentality of the peoples. It infected and dominated public opinion. As a result of this spirit of hatred, unreason began to triumph and the simplest problems in international life, even those which were in a nation's own interests were misjudged because of the poisoning effect of blind passion. . . .

All this began in the year 1918. It was then in an especially intrusive way that there was inaugurated the "statesmanship" which through its own lack of reason created problems which it could not solve and, failing in their solution, cried out in fear about them. This

unreasonableness entirely overlooks the fact that an historical political dissection of a people does not obliterate the real historical traditions of that people; it only hampers or even makes impossible the preservation of the vital interests of a nation and the organization of the conditions necessary for its spiritual life. This was that lack of reason which in the case of Germany, for instance, resulted in methodically cutting off a nation of 65,000,000 from all vital connections with the outer world, which robbed her of all economic relations, confiscated all property abroad, ruined trade, and burdened this nation with a debt whose proportions can be expressed only in astronomical figures. This was the folly which in the end brought foreign credits with which to pay off these debts. And to pay the interest on these credits, Germany had to expand her exports artificially, no matter what the cost. Finally, high tariff walls were erected against her goods. Thus Germany was plunged into fearful misery and then accused of ill-will and inability to pay. That, however, was then called "wise statesmanship." (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

The Plundering Peace Dictators

Hatred, malice, and unreason were the intellectual forbears of the Treaty of Versailles. Living space and states with a history going back a thousand years were arbitrarily broken up and dissolved. People who belonged together since time immemorial were torn asunder; economic conditions of life were ignored while the peoples themselves were converted into victors and vanquished, into masters possessing all the rights and slaves possessing none.

This document of Versailles has fortunately been set down in black and white for later generations, for otherwise it would have been regarded as a legendary product of a wild, corrupt fantasy. Nearly 115,000,000 people were robbed of their right of self-determination, not by the victorious soldiers, but by mad politicians and were arbitrarily removed from old communities and made part of new ones without any consideration of blood, origin, common sense, or the economic conditions of life. The results were appalling. Though at that time the statesmen were able to destroy a great many things, there was one factor which could not be eliminated. The gigantic mass of people living in Central Europe, crowded together in a confined space, could insure its daily bread only by the highest intensity of work and the highest degree of order.

But what did these statesmen of the so-called democratic empires know of these problems? A horde of the most stupid and ignorant people was let loose on humanity. In districts in which about 140 people per square kilometer had to gain a livelihood, they destroyed the order which had been built up during the course of nearly 2,000 years of historical development, and created disorder without themselves being able or willing to solve the problems confronting the communal life of these people—for which, moreover, as dictators of the new world order, they had at that time undertaken responsibility. When this new world order turned out to be a catastrophe, however, the democratic peace dictators of American and European origin were so cowardly that none of them ventured to take the responsibility for what occurred. Each put the blame on the other, thus endeavoring to save himself from the judgment of history. However, the people who were maltreated by their hatred and unreason were, unfortunately, not in a position to share in the escape with those who had injured them.

It is impossible to enumerate the stages of the suffering of our own people. Robbed of the whole of its colonial possessions, deprived of all its financial resources, plundered by so-called reparations and thus impoverished, our nation was driven into the blackest period of its national misfortune. And let it be noted that this was not National Socialist Germany, but democratic Germany—the Germany which was weak enough to trust even for a single moment the promises of democratic statesmen. The misery resulting therefrom and the continuous want slowly brought our nation to political despair. The most respectable and the most industrious people of Central Europe thought that they could see the possibility of deliverance in the complete destruction of the old order which appeared to have become a curse.

Jewish parasites, on the one hand, plundered the nation ruthlessly, and, on the other hand, incited the people, reduced as it was to misery. As the misfortune of our nation became the only aim and object of this race, it was possible to breed among the growing army of unemployed suitable elements for the Bolshevik Revolution. The decay of political order and the confusion of public opinion by the irresponsible Jewish press led to ever stronger shocks to economic life and consequently to increasing misery and to greater readiness to absorb subversive Bolshevik ideas. The army of the Jewish world revolution, as the army of unemployed was called, finally rose to almost 7,000,000.

Germany had never known these conditions. In the living space of the great German people and of the old Habsburg states belonging

thereto, despite all the difficulties of the struggle for existence involved in the excessive density of the population, economic life had not become more uncertain in the course of time but, on the contrary, more and more secure. Industry and diligence, great thrift, and the love of scrupulous order—though they did not enable the people in this territory to accumulate excessive riches—did at any rate insure them against abject misery. The results of the wretched peace forced upon them by the democratic dictators were thus all the more terrible for these people who were condemned at Versailles. Today we know the reason for this frightful outcome of the Great War.

In the first place, it was the greed for spoils. That which seldom pays in private life, could, they believed, when enlarged a million fold, be represented to mankind as a profitable experiment. If large nations are plundered and the utmost squeezed out of them, it will then be possible to live a life of carefree idleness. Such was the opinion of these economic dilettantes. To that end the states themselves had to be dismembered. Germany had to be deprived of her colonial possessions, although they were without any value to the world-democracies; the most important districts yielding raw materials had to be invaded and—if necessary—placed under the influence of the democracies; above all the unfortunate victims of that democratic ill-treatment of nations and individuals had to be prevented from ever recovering, let alone rising against their oppressors. Thus was concocted the devilish plan to burden generations with the curse of those dictates. For 60, 70, or 100 years Germany was to pay sums so exorbitant that the question of how they were actually to be raised must remain a mystery to all concerned. To raise such sums in gold, foreign currency, or by way of regular payments in kind would have been absolutely impossible without ruining the blinded collectors of this tribute as well. As a matter of fact, these democratic peace dictators thoroughly destroyed world economy with their Versailles madness. . . .

One of the most shameful acts of oppression ever committed was the dismemberment of the German nation and the political disintegration—provided for in the dictate of Versailles—of the area in which it had, after all, lived for over a thousand years.

I have never, gentlemen, left any doubt that in point of fact it is scarcely possible anywhere in Europe to arrive at a harmony of state and national boundaries which will be satisfactory in every way. On the one hand, the migration of peoples, which gradually came to a standstill during the last few centuries, and the development of large communities on the other have brought about a situation which, what-

ever way they look at it, must necessarily be considered unsatisfactory to those concerned. It was, however, the very way in which these national and political developments were gradually stabilized in the last century which led many to consider themselves justified in cherishing the hope that in the end a compromise would be found between respect for the national life of the various European peoples and the recognition of established political structures—a compromise by which, without destroying the political order in Europe and with it the existing economic basis, nationalities could nevertheless be preserved.

This hope was abolished by the Great War. The peace dictate of Versailles did justice neither to one principle nor to the other. Neither the right of self-determination nor the political, let alone the economic, necessities and conditions for European development were respected. Nevertheless, I never left any doubt that—as I have already emphasized—even a revision of the Treaty of Versailles would also have to have its limits. And I have always said so with the utmost frankness—not for any tactical reasons but from my innermost conviction. As the national leader of the German people, I have never left any doubt that, whenever the higher interests of the European system were at stake, national interests must, if necessary, be relegated to second place in certain cases. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

Injustice and Misunderstanding

The fate which this town [Danzig] and this beautiful country have experienced has been the fate of all Germany. The World War, probably the most senseless struggle of all time, claims this country and this town among its victims. This World War, which brought losses to all and gains to none, must have left each one of us firmly convinced that a similar fate should never overtake us again; unfortunately today that appears to have been forgotten by the very people who at that time were the principal war mongers and probably the parties chiefly interested in that universal slaughter. When the murderous conflict of those days, into which Germany entered without any war aims, came to an end, humanity was to be assured a peace which would lead to a rebirth of justice and thereby to a final abolition of all distress. At Versailles this peace was not put before our nation for negotiation, but was forced upon us as a brutal dictate. The progenitors of this peace visualized in it the end of the German nation.

There may have been many people who believed that this peace

would mean the end of all distress; yet it was only the beginning of new confusion. There was, however, one point where those who instigated and ended that war were mistaken. By their peace they did not succeed in solving a single problem, but only created countless new ones. It was but a question of time until the German nation, which they had trampled under foot, would rise again to find, of its own accord, some solution for the problems which had been forced upon it. The essential problem was completely overlooked in those days—namely, that nations happen to exist irrespective of whether this may or may not suit this or that British war monger. The fact remains that 82,000,000 Germans are united in this living-space, and that these 82,000,000 want to live and will live, even if this should not happen to suit the war mongers. The grossest injustice was done to Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. If a statesman of another nation considers himself justified in declaring today that he has no confidence in the word of German statesmen and of the German nation, then we Germans have the right to reply that we lack all confidence in the assurances of those who at that time so miserably broke their most solemn promises.

I do not intend to speak about the injustices of Versailles. Perhaps the worst thing in the lives of the nations is not so much the injustice, but the senselessness, the folly, and the utter stupidity with which in those days a peace was imposed upon the world, that completely disregarded all historical, economic, national and political facts. Stipulations were made which actually force one to doubt whether the men who perpetrated them were really in their right minds. Devoid of all knowledge of the historical development of these districts, devoid even of all economic understanding, these people juggled the map of Europe, tore states apart, divided up countries, suppressed and handed over nations, and destroyed venerable cultures. (Danzig, Sept. 19, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 20, 1939)

A Humiliating Insult

The program of the National Socialist Movement, insofar as it affected the future development of the Reich's relations with the rest of the world, is simply an attempt to bring about a definite revision of the Treaty of Versailles, though as far as at all possible, this was to be accomplished by peaceful means. This revision was absolutely essential. The conditions imposed at Versailles were intolerable, not only because of their humiliating discrimination and because the dis-

armament which they insured deprived the German nation of all its rights, but far more because of the consequent destruction of the material existence of one of the great civilized nations of the world and the proposed annihilation of its future, the utterly senseless accumulation of immense tracts of territory under the domination of a number of states, the theft of all the irreparable foundations of life and indispensable vital necessities from a conquered nation.

Even while this dictate was being drawn up, men of insight, even among our foes, were uttering warnings about the terrible consequences which the ruthless application of its insane conditions would entail, a proof that even among them, the conviction predominated that such a dictate could not possibly be upheld in days to come. Their objections and protests were silenced by the assurance that the statutes of the newly created League of Nations provided for the revision of these conditions. In fact, the League was supposed to be the competent authority. The hope of revision was thus at no time regarded as presumption but as something natural.

Unfortunately, the Geneva institution, as those responsible for Versailles had intended, never looked upon itself as a body competent to undertake any sensible revision, but from the very outset as nothing more than the guarantor of the ruthless enforcement and maintenance of the conditions imposed at Versailles. All attempts made by democratic Germany to obtain equality for the German people by revision of the treaty proved unavailing. It is always in the interest of the conqueror to represent stipulations that are to his advantage as sacrosanct, while the instinct of self-preservation in the vanquished leads him to acquire the common human rights that he has lost. For him, the dictate of an overbearing conqueror has all the less legal force since he has never been honorably conquered. Owing to a rare misfortune, the German Empire between 1914-1918 lacked good leadership. To this, and to the as yet unenlightened faith and trust placed by the German people in the words of democratic statesmen, our downfall was due.

Hence, the Franco-British claim that the dictate of Versailles was a sort of international, holy, supreme code of laws appeared to be nothing more than a piece of insolent arrogance to every honest German. The assumption, however, that British or French statesmen should actually claim to be the guardians of justice, and even of human culture, is mere stupid effrontery—a piece of effrontery that is thrown into a sufficiently glaring light by their own extremely negligible achievements in this direction. Seldom have any countries in the

world been ruled with a lesser degree of wisdom, morality, and culture than those which are at this moment exposed to the ragings of certain democratic statesmen.

The program of the National Socialist Movement, besides freeing the Reich from the innermost fetters of a small sub-stratum of Jewish, capitalistic, and plutodemocratic profiteers, proclaimed to the world our resolution to shake off the shackles of the Versailles dictate. Germany's demands for this revision were a vital necessity and essential to the existence and honor of every great nation. They will probably one day be regarded by posterity as extremely reasonable. . . .

One of the most despicable and foolish measures of the Versailles dictate, namely the severance of an old German province from the Reich, was crying out loud for revision. But what were my requests? I name myself in this connection because no other statesman might have dared to propose a solution such as mine to the German nation. It merely required the return of Danzig, an ancient and purely German city, to the Reich and the creation of a means of communication between the Reich and its severed province. Even this was to be decided by a plebiscite, subject to the control of an international body. If Mr. Churchill and the rest of the war mongers had felt a fraction of the responsibility toward Europe that inspired me they could never have begun their infamous game.

It was only due to these other European and non-European powers and their war interests that Poland rejected my proposals which in no way affected either her honor or her existence, and in their stead had recourse to terror and the sword. In this case we once more showed unexampled and truly superhuman self-control, since for months, despite murderous attacks on minority Germans and even despite the slaughter of tens of thousands of our German *Volksgenossen*, we still sought an understanding by peaceful means.

What was the situation? One of the most unnatural creations of the dictate of Versailles, puffed up with political and military pomp, insults another state for months on end and threatens to grind it to powder, to fight battles on the outskirts of Berlin, to hack the German armies to pieces, to extend its frontiers to the Oder or to the Elbe, and so forth. Meanwhile, the other state, Germany, watches this tumult in patient silence, although a single movement of her arms would have sufficed to prick this bubble, inflated with folly and hatred. (Berlin, July 19, 1940; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 21, 1940)

The Abolition of the Treaty of Versailles

My program was to abolish the Treaty of Versailles. It is futile nonsense for the rest of the world to pretend today that I did not reveal this program until 1933, or 1935, or 1937. Instead of listening to the foolish chatter of émigrés, these gentlemen would have been wiser to read what I have written—and rewritten thousands of times. No human being has declared or recorded what he wanted more often than I. Again and again I wrote these words—the Abolition of the Treaty of Versailles. Not because it was a quixotic idea of my own, but because the Treaty of Versailles was the greatest injustice and the most infamous maltreatment of a great nation in recorded history and because it was impossible for our nation to continue to exist in the future unless Germany was free of this stranglehold. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1941; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 1, 1941)

The Enslavement of Germany

From the point of view of foreign policy, the dictate [of Versailles] deprived the German nation of all its rights and rendered it defenseless. The foreign situation, moreover, also demanded a clear decision. The shameful dictate was intended to enslave the German nation forever. No limits had been set to this slavery. From the very outset they said: We will not state a definite sum for you to pay because we do not know what you are able to pay. From time to time we will fix new sums; but you must pledge yourselves immediately to pay everything we determine. That is what the German Governments of those days did.

The fulfilment of these obligations would have reduced Germany to complete ruin forever. When a Frenchman said that the aim was really to annihilate 20,000,000 Germans, that was by no means mere imagination. It was entirely possible to calculate the time when the German nation would actually number 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 less. . . .

It was in this very town that I began my struggle, my political struggle against Versailles. How often did I speak against Versailles! I probably studied this treaty more than any other man. To this day I have not forgotten it. The treaty could not be abolished by humility, by submission. It could only be abolished by reliance upon ourselves, by the strength of the German nation. (Munich, Feb. 24, 1941; *Berliner Börsen Zeitung*, Feb. 25, 1941)

13

The Stab in the Back Myth

It was not so much the enemy that defeated us as it was the poison of our own parties that paralyzed us.

Munich, Aug. 12, 1930.

They would never have defeated Germany then [1918] if their allies had not broken us on the home front.

Munich, Nov. 8, 1940

According to the "stab-in-the-back" thesis, the German Army was not defeated in the first World War; the military was forced to surrender because revolutionary elements in Germany had dealt it a fatal blow from behind the lines. The origin of this myth has been generally attributed to the Kaiser's High Command. Both Ludendorff and Hindenburg openly spread the myth after 1918.

According to Hitler's preachments, the poison of Marxism, inner political weakness, propaganda, deceit, lies, defeatist elements, and the Jews brought on the Revolution and the German collapse of 1918.

The assertion that Germany did not lose the war from the military point of view is patent nonsense. The war was lost on the Western front. Four years of stubborn Allied resistance, the strangling British blockade, superiority in the production of weapons, and the forceful drive by fresh American troops finally swung the balance. Although Germany's military feats had been spectacular, her position in the autumn of 1918 was hopeless. This was openly admitted by her own leaders at the time. After the "black day" of August 8th, even Ludendorff had "no more hope for the offensive." And Hindenburg's historic letter of October 3rd to the new Chancellor, Prince Max, proved beyond a modicum of doubt that he regarded defeat as inevitable. Defeatist propaganda was at work within Germany; intrigue and revolution developed toward the end—but this was the result, not the cause, of the German collapse.

The German High Command used the "stab" myth as a face-saving device; Hitler has employed it to serve his own ends. He has studiously fostered the myth because his aims and policies have depended upon the acceptance of reasons other than military defeat for Germany's downfall. By tacking this odium on the Communists and the Jews, he has promoted his anti-Bolshevik crusade and set another fire ablaze in his racial witch-hunt. Moreover, by identifying the Weimar Republic with the November Revolution, he has fostered resentment toward democratic institutions. Lastly, aware of the average German's pride in his country's military tradition, Hitler has tried to perpetuate the legend of German invincibility.

The Poison of Marxism

Why did Germany collapse in 1918? Was it because of the superior strength of her enemies as such? Was it because of their superior leadership as well as Germany's own inferior leadership? Was it because of Germany's lack of strength, or something on that order? No, and thrice no! . . .

The superior leadership on the part of our enemies, at least insofar as the military side is concerned, was not able to crush the German people. Had this been the case, the tragedy would have been brought to an end already in 1915 or 1916, for then the enemy, often twice or even three times as strong in numbers and supplies, stormed our Western front—a front which was many a time completely devoid of reserves. As a consequence, our collapse could not have been caused by inferior leadership, for since the enemy was numerically considerably stronger already in the first days of the war, it was only because of German leadership that this unevenly matched struggle could be kept up for four and a half years. This was the merit of the German leaders from the field marshal down to the last non-commissioned officer.

The question of military supplies could not have been the cause of the German collapse. A weapon in itself is always but a dead piece of metal, and it is up to the one who wields it to give to the dead material, by the force of the energy of his own will, that strength which is capable of winning victories. The situation of the German Army, viewed purely from the standpoint of supplies, was much more critical from the winter of 1916 till autumn of 1916 than it was, for instance, in 1917. And yet—in the battles of Champagne, Loretto, Loos, Arras, Festubert, Nieuve-Chapelle, Ypres, Somme and Flanders we find an iron front; in the autumn of 1918, however, retreating masses.

No, that which paralyzed the German people and later gnawed it to its very marrow was the poison of a doctrine which had been active forty years previously, and which was recognized by only a few for what it actually represented. It was a doctrine which in the first rush of enthusiasm in 1914 had been considered by the superficial observer as overcome, but it only continued to gnaw far more effectively than ever before. The doctrine was Marxism, the doctrine which denies the value of the great leader, and proposes class warfare.

This doctrine presents three preposterous theories. First: Negation of the value of the great leader. The eternally creative force of individuality is to be replaced by the infertility of a numerical majority; the cultural significance of the nation by the unimaginative impotence

of fictitious internationalism. The negation of the great leader as the most vivid expression of the character of a people necessarily leads to the negation of that people itself and results in the negation of the significance of the race itself. . . . Second: Denial of private property as such. While the negation of the value of the great leader destroys the foundation of culture, the demand for the elimination of private property means the doing away with the foundations of human economy. With clever dexterity, this doctrine knows how to obliterate the differences between the concepts of state property and personal property. It counts on the generally very inadequate understanding of economics on the part of the broad masses, and makes use of the economic abuses of certain classes of society. Thirdly, in setting up two basic theses, the enactment of which on the one hand means the destruction of all human culture . . . and on the other hand the collapse of any higher form of economy . . . this doctrine alienates all intelligentsia in the political as well as the economic field. The greater the idealism of a political thinker or economic theoretician, the more he is obliged by love of truth and idealism to leave a movement that defies truth.

Marxism necessarily must become a movement of people who, engaged in nothing but physical labor, do not have the ability to think clearly or as a result of their work have become hostile to mental labor. It is a gigantic organization of working animals without spiritual leadership. Marxism, therefore, must become class warfare, and thereby it becomes what its founders wanted it to be: An instrument which deprives things of their spirit, an instrument in the service of a race striving for world domination and deadly opposed to true socialism. It is the weapon needed by the Jew of the international stock exchange in order to conquer this world. Deep are the impressions which this doctrine has made on our people. The idea of authority has been overthrown; freedom of action and the creative opportunities of the individual are restricted; the genius of leadership is shackled, which paralyzes any free development. In place of all this there is the democratic principle of decision by the majority, which always signifies the victory of the meaner, the more inferior, the weaker, and above all of the cowardly and irresponsible. The individual is smothered by the masses.

We see the destructive consequences of this in both the political as well as economic field. This madness manifests itself most fatefully, however, in the nation's attitude toward the most vital questions of its existence. The belief in the eternal right of one's own

people, in the national will, which is the only force capable of saving us, is shaken, and this is replaced by the stupid hope in love and conciliation as possible bases of a newly conceived world order of the future. Activated by this madness, a people of 70,000,000 throws away its weapons and falls for the line of a crafty American [Wilson]. Insofar as our present fate is the outcome of faith in this doctrine, a faith which unwittingly leads to disaster, it might be termed tragic. Since, however, the leaders and organizers of that movement were not, like the mass of their followers, acting unwittingly, but were consciously and purposely destroying the people and the state, for the sake of the meanest party prejudices, there can be no more talk of tragedy but only of a dastardly crime.

Millions of Germans who, caught in this madness, listened to the deceptive voices of their international leaders, can and must be forgiven, particularly since the responsible government did not take any serious steps to deliver them from their plight. Those tens of thousands, however, who consciously and with criminal intent organized and accomplished this greatest crime in the history of the world, who stole the weapons out of the hands of the German people and helped to put the shackles of the golden Internationale on us, can never be forgiven. That can be repaid in only one way—by unmitigated revenge. Two million dead demand that the theft of the sacrifice of their lives be avenged. Those victorious and heroic dead will be the avenging spirits of the awakening Germany. No matter how fate treats Germany, one thing is sure; as long as this people does not eliminate the murderers within itself, it can never be successful in foreign affairs. . . .

Whoever wants this fire [of enthusiasm for the freedom, power and glory of the Fatherland] to consume every single German must realize that first of all the arch-enemies of German freedom, namely, the betrayers of the German Fatherland, must be done away with. Therefore, this will for the most moral demand for justice must gather ever greater force: Down with the perpetrators of the November crime. And here the great mission of our Movement begins. In all this prattle about a "united front" and the like, we must not forget that between us and those betrayers of the people, those seducers of the workers, and the criminals of the Right there are 2,000,000 dead. . . . We must always remember that in any new conflict in the field of foreign affairs the German Siegfried will again be stabbed in the back if those November criminals are permitted to exist. (Munich, Jan. 25, 1923; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 27, 1923)

Inner Political Weakness

Think back to the year 1918. The German people, which still in the summer had been at the height of its power, had collapsed within a few months and now lay prostrate, completely wrecked and shattered. One question must have confronted everybody at that time: Is it possible to rise again from this depth of misery and misfortune? That question forced itself on everyone. Basically, it determined the thought in the minds of those who had probably been instrumental in bringing about the collapse. In lucid moments they also asked themselves whether and when Germany would rise again. One had to realize that a fateful question had been put before the German people, the answer and solution to which would decide the future existence or non-existence of our people.

The tragedy of our collapse lay not in military defeat, nor in the horrible peace as such, nor in the oppression resulting therefrom, nor in the lack of armament and defense, nor in all that which afflicted Germany these many years. The tragedy lay in the fact that all this came about through our own fault—that millions of Germans not only did not realize this even at the last moment, but actually welcomed it. It lay in the fact that hundreds of thousands rejoiced at the defeat; that millions acclaimed our disarmament; and that many saw in all our oppression by the enemy a just judgment and the execution of justified punishment. The fact that a great part of the German people no longer cared about the misery of the Fatherland—that was the tragic misfortune and the horrible disaster that befell us.

This brings us to a basic question, the answer to which holds the fate of the German nation. And this question is, will it still be possible in Germany to reintegrate the masses of those who have lost faith in their people and who look upon their enemy as more of a brother than their own *Volksgenosse* who happens to differ from them in regard to party ideals or philosophy; will it be possible to reintegrate these masses into one unified national community? Yes or no? If this question is not answered in the affirmative, the German nation will be doomed. For peoples can perish. It is madness to believe that a great people of sixty or seventy million cannot be destroyed. It perishes as soon as it loses its drive of self-preservation. There are 18,000,000 in the German Reich today who are still of the opinion that self-preservation as such is no justification for the existence of our people on this earth, but that our existence is conditional on some kind of a fantastic conception of the interests of others. . . . That is the misfortune of the

German people. As long as this condition is permitted to prevail, any thought of liberating the German people is Utopia. And why?

In the first place, why did we actually collapse? We collapsed because for years on end too many sins had been committed in domestic politics and in the old Reich, and because the Reich was denied the means necessary for its existence. We collapsed because for a long time already the most sacred matters of the whole nation were used for purposes of party politics. We collapsed because millions were unwilling to sacrifice their all for the preservation of their people and their country, but were determined to sacrifice both for the sake of their party. We collapsed because the overwhelming majority of our pacifist, anti-national and Marxist citizens no longer gave the state that which was necessary for its existence. And we collapsed as regards foreign policy because the other countries knew only too well our inner political weaknesses. They readily recognized the Achilles heel of the German Reich and they knew exactly how the balance of power stood in Parliament. They knew perfectly well that any policy of active self-preservation would be defeated by the majority of lukewarm, cowardly and stupid individuals in this country. And today, as before the year 1918, the question is still the same. Can this situation be altered or not? (Munich, Feb. 27, 1925)

Revolution Forced Surrender

When the Revolution forced us to surrender in 1918, a war which the German people had not wanted—we should emphasize this again and again—came to an end. We surrendered because many a German, which was understandable at the time, trusted in the assurances of a certain statesman, namely, President Wilson. If the German people and its government had wanted this war, it would have been fought at a different time and under different circumstances. We do not wish to quibble today about the question of war guilt. It may have been a stroke of fate for which, of course, somebody was responsible. However, we know one thing: our people did not want the war. It came upon this people in the same way perhaps that it came upon other peoples. All that the German people did at the time was to defend its life and existence with spirit and bravery. And if we were of the

*Die Rede Adolf Hitlers in der ersten grossen Massenversammlung (Muenchener Buergerbraeu-Keller vom 27. Februar 1925) bei Wiederaufrichtung der Nationalsozialistischen deutschen Arbeiterpartei. Munich, 1925.

conviction that it was necessary for us to defend our freedom, the Treaty of Versailles did not prove to us that we were wrong; on the contrary, it showed us what we were actually up against.

What did the German people do at the time of the war? It did nothing more than what the other peoples were doing. It did its duty. Though our defeat in the end was a great misfortune, it was no disgrace. We fought valiantly until the last moment. Only when we realized that further resistance was in vain, because of the Revolution at home, did we surrender, and then as the result of assurances that had been given to us. We knew full well that in history it is self-understood that the victor has the right to make the conditions of peace. The victor, however, cannot interpret this to mean that he has the moral right to declare that people which had the misfortune of losing a war, as a people of second rank and therefore an underprivileged people for all time to come. This is all the more true when the vanquished lays down his arms only because he is given solemn assurances. (Berlin, Oct. 24, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 26, 1933)

Military Honor and Glory

The German was always a good soldier. Military service was not looked upon by our people as something compulsory, but at all times in our history it was considered as the highest honor to serve in arms. . . . The German was not only a good soldier in peace time, but he was also a brave fighter. . . . The German people did not go to pieces [in 1918] from the military point of view. It went to pieces solely because it lost its inner unity and its inner faith in its rights. This faith, however, has returned today, and not only hundreds of thousands of you, my soldiers, have this faith, but millions upon millions of our *Volksgenossen* surround you with this ardent faith, with this fervent confidence and this warm love. . . .

You, my comrades, carry in your weapons and helmets a great and noble legacy. You are not something that has been artificially constructed, with no tradition, with no past. On the contrary, no matter what there may be in Germany [in respect to greatness and fame] it must follow, as far as tradition is concerned, behind that which you must personify and which you can personify. Indeed, you do not need to win a crown of glory for the German Army, the German Army already possesses that. You only need to preserve it. And when you stand here armed with steel, it is not because we believe we have to

repair the honor of the German people. Insofar as this honor was in the hands of our soldiers, nobody in the world has yet been able to take it from us. Germany did not lose her military honor, least of all in the last war. We, therefore, do not need to regain that honor. We shall see to it in the future, however, that so much honor, so much heroism and so many sacrifices shall not be in vain as was the case in the past. (Nuremberg, Sept. 16, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 17, 1935)

The Poison of Propaganda

No people can claim for itself the glory of having beaten us, least of all that nation [England] whose statesmen today boast the most. Germany at that time remained undefeated and unvanquished on land, at sea, and in the air. And yet we lost the war. We know the power which defeated Germany at that time. It was the power of a falsehood, the poison of a propaganda which shrank from no distortion, from no untruth, over against which the German Reich stood virtually defenseless, because it was unprepared for it. (Wilhelmshaven, April 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 3, 1939)

Unvanquished by Arms

The fact that during the four years between 1919 and 1923 the National Socialist Movement grew to such an extent that it was possible for the first time to rouse the whole nation's interest in an event of no mean importance is to be ascribed to the general state of affairs in Germany at that time. A terrible catastrophe had come upon our people and our country. After nearly forty-five years of peace, Germany had been forced into a war. There was much talk of war guilt. We know today and knew then that up to 1914 the governments of the Reich could be accused of only one crime, namely, that they had not done everything which could and should have been done for the sake of national security.

They could further be accused of guilt in that they allowed themselves to be dragged into war at what was, for Germany, the most inopportune moment. There can be no doubt that if Germany had really desired war she could have seized many a better and earlier opportunity. The Powers which were then ranged against us have once again plotted a war by means of the self-same slogans and the self-same lies. All of us who saw active service during the last war know that the British and the French did not defeat us on the field of battle.

It took a campaign of lies to rob our nation of its weapons.

It may be that today certain persons abroad are amazed at my tremendous self-confidence. All I can say is that I acquired that self-confidence on the field of battle. During those four years I never for one moment felt or was oppressed by the thought that any of our adversaries were superior to us. Neither the British nor the French were any more courageous, more daring, or more fearless in the face of death than the German soldier. It was the lies of our enemies which led to Germany's downfall at that time—the lies of the same men who are busy lying today; they are the self-same war mongers who confronted Germany during the Great War. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 10, 1939)

The Germans Deserved Their Fate

Twenty-five years ago the German people entered into a war which had been forced upon them. In those days Germany was not well armed. France had made much better use of her national resources than the Germany of pre-war days. Russia was the most formidable adversary. It was possible to mobilize the whole world against Germany. But she entered the struggle. In its course, she accomplished deeds of heroism which were little short of miraculous. And Providence watched over our people. In 1914 German soil was freed from the danger of foreign invasion. In 1915, the situation of the Reich improved; 1916 and 1917 were years of continuous and bitter struggle. Sometimes Germany seemed to be on the verge of collapse but was saved again and again as if by a miracle.

In those days, Germany furnished amazing proof of her strength and it was obvious that Providence had bestowed its blessing upon her. Then the German people became ungrateful. Instead of having faith in their own future and their own strength, they began to place their trust in the promises of others. And finally in their ingratitude, they even rose up against their own state and their own leaders. From that time forth, Providence turned its face from the German people. Since then, I have never regarded this catastrophe as undeserved. I have never complained that Providence treated us unjustly. On the contrary, I have always expressed the opinion that it gave us just what we deserved. The German nation was ungrateful and, therefore, was denied its final reward. This will never be repeated in the history of our nation. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1940; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1940)

Defeat Through Lies and Deceit

Twenty years ago I appeared for the first time in this hall before the general public. That which brought me here at the time was the most difficult and most fanatic decision of my life. The fact that I see before me here in this group today so many of my fellow fighters of twenty years ago is in itself remarkable. I do not know how many of the leaders of the democratic countries can appear again before their first followers as I do after so many years. It was no pacifist conviction that caused me to enter this hall in those days. I was still a soldier at that time, a soldier in body and soul! That which brought me here then was my protest as a soldier against what today can be called the greatest humiliation of our people.

An unparalleled collapse had befallen our people—a collapse which was unparalleled in history for the reason that the so-called vanquished had fallen victim to a monstrous self-deception. As a matter of fact, we were not the only ones who were deceived. The victors also deceived their own people. In all the so-called victorious nations, the peoples did not get what they had expected. An era of justice was supposed to emerge, but also within the victorious nations themselves, the social justice which had been promised was not forthcoming. It was, however, our German people that was deceived most of all. The German people laid down its arms on the basis of promises which were set forth in the Fourteen Points. The result was Spaa and finally Versailles.

This was the beginning of a new world order, that is, of the so-called victors and vanquished, a world order wherein the victors had all the rights and the vanquished none at all. There were others who were also deceived. The victorious nations deceived the Italians, they deceived the Hindus. The Hindus were promised their freedom if they would fight for England. The victors deceived the Arabs. The Arabs were told that they would be given a large Arabian empire of their own. At the same time, of course, the Jews also were deceived, for to begin with they had been assured of getting the very same territory that had been promised to the Arabs.

In view of our total collapse there were many people in all walks of life who believed that the end of the German nation was at hand. I was of a different opinion. What many believed was the end, I considered only the beginning, for what had actually collapsed at the time? Untenable structures had been destroyed, structures which would not have been able to stand up much longer anyhow. The

bourgeois-capitalist world had collapsed. It had outlived itself. This collapse is bound to occur everywhere sooner or later in some form or other. There will not be an exception anywhere.

At that time there was only one decisive factor as far as we were concerned: At that time when so many external institutions of a formal nature were destroyed, the German individual as such was not destroyed. In fact, he had just accomplished a feat which no other people on this earth had ever accomplished. In a war which lasted four years this people had withstood twenty-six nations and it was defeated only by means of lies and deceit. If there had not been Germans in those days who destroyed the confidence in their own regime, England and France would never have won. If in those days a certain Adolf Hitler had been Chancellor of the German Reich instead of a musketeer in the German Army, do you believe that the capitalist idols of international democracy would have won? (Munich, Feb. 24, 1940; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 26, 1940)

Not Actually Conquered

The Great War which shook Europe from 1914 to 1918 was exclusively the deliberate work of British politicians. In spite of the fact that the whole world was mobilized against her, Germany was not actually conquered. We do not hesitate to say that today. I did not wish to criticize the past until I had done something better myself. Today, however, as one of the men who have done better, I am in a position to judge and to criticize the past. I can only say that the disaster of 1918 was nothing but the result of a rare conglomeration of personal incompetence in the leadership of our people—an unparalleled conglomeration such as never occurred in the past and will, I assure you, never be repeated in the future. Nevertheless, the German soldier withstood the onslaught of the world in arms for over four years. And he would have held out longer, had it not been for a further factor, namely, the belief of the German people in the honor of the "democratic" world and its politicians. The faith which the German people had in that world's promises at the time, caused it terrible suffering.

If the British believe that it is sufficient today to play the old propaganda gramophone records of 1917-18 with the object of producing new effects, I can only say that they have forgotten nothing, nor, unfortunately for them, have they learned anything. That is where they differ from the German people. The German people have

learned since that time, and have forgotten nothing. We do not wish to be petty.

There have been other breaches of faith in history. But what took place in the years 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921 was not one breach of faith but a whole series of such breaches. It was not a matter of breaking one promise; indeed, not a single promise was kept. Never has a great nation been deceived as Germany was then. What did they promise us, this credulous people, and what did they do to us? We were plundered and exploited. They used foreign statesmen from America to induce greater credulity in the German people. Perhaps that was the reason why the German people let themselves be deceived by the maneuver. Now, the German people are for all time immune against similar attempts. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1941; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 1, 1941)

Disintegration at Home

In those days [post-war years] we were in the middle of a great collapse; Versailles oppressed us all heavily. With heavy hearts individuals throughout the entire German Reich began to try to find a way out of this profound misery. There were many different views as to the reasons for the collapse. Political mistakes of the most serious kind had undoubtedly been made, not during the war years but many years before. It had been apparent that a storm was brewing. Certain war mongers throughout the world—the very ones who are doing the same thing today—were mobilizing the whole of Europe against Germany.

Although favorable opportunities of opposing these war mongers—and, moreover, of opposing them in good time—had presented themselves, the German Government of that time proved a political failure. At the beginning of the Great War, too, the political leadership in both internal and external affairs was as clumsy as possible and, from the psychological point of view, utterly wrong. However, in one particular sphere no reproach could be levelled against them: They had not wanted the war. On the contrary, had they wanted the war they would certainly have prepared for it differently, and they would have chosen a more favorable time for it. No, their greatest crime—if a mistake can be called thus—was that, although they knew that war was inevitable, they failed to act at the decisive hour and, consequently, at a more propitious time. Military mistakes were made too—many military mistakes. Yet, despite all this, one fact remains: the German soldier, unconquered, defied his enemies for over four years.

A unique epic was enacted during these four years. Regardless of the greatness of our present victories or of our victories in the future, the German nation will always look back with deep emotion and inexpressible feelings to the great days of the World War when, alone and forsaken by the whole world, it fought a heroic struggle against an overwhelming superiority in numbers and an overpowering mass of armaments, yet never yielded one inch until the collapse occurred for which not the man at the front but disintegration at home was responsible. This brings us to the really fundamental and decisive reason for the actual cause of the collapse which took place at that time. The German nation had for several decades been exposed to gradual internal disintegration. (Munich, Feb. 24, 1941; *Berliner Boersen Zeitung*, Feb. 25, 1941)

The Jews, the Jews, the Jews

The hidden forces which in 1914 incited England to the first World War, were Jews. The forces which then paralyzed us and finally forced us to surrender were Jewish. Jews instigated the Revolution, which robbed us of any possibility of further resistance. . . . When in November 1918 the German nation, dazed by the mendacious ideology of Wilson, President of the United States at the time, laid down its arms undefeated and left the battlefield, it did so under the influence of the Jewish race which hoped to erect a firm bulwark for the benefit of Bolshevism in the very heart of Europe. (Berlin, April 26, 1942; B.B.C.)

Defeatist Elements

After a historic resistance which could not be broken by any enemy throughout four years of struggle, defeatist elements both from within and without forced her [Germany] into open revolution. The American President Wilson with his Fourteen Points conjured up a vision of future peace which was eagerly seized upon by the German people—more so as there had been no positive war aims either among the great masses or among leading personalities. The nation was fighting for its mere existence and some sections of the population were therefore almost grateful to have a peace of conciliation. . . .

Immediately after the German people had thus been induced to give up their arms, there came a historic swindle, a breach of promise such as world history has never known before. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1943; *New York Times*, Jan. 31, 1943)

14

Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points

For four years our enemies tried to defeat us, and they finally had to get an American medicine man who found the formula that deceived the German people.

Munich, Nov. 8, 1940

History has already passed its verdict on Wilson; his name stands for one of the basest breaches of the given word.

Berlin, Nov. 11, 1941

President Wilson's Fourteen Points have been more consistently distorted by Hitler than any other subject relating to the United States. With unfailing tenacity, he has asserted that Germany was induced to stop fighting by Wilson's promises and that these promises were never fulfilled. In short, Wilson has been represented as the "American medicine man" who brazenly duped the German people.

Actually, the German leaders were opposed to the Fourteen Points so long as they felt that Germany could win the war. They began to evince interest in Wilson's program only when their confidence in victory faded into the prospect of certain defeat.

It is generally agreed that the Fourteen Points constituted a contract between the Allied Powers and Germany to govern the peace terms. It is also recognized that there were many discrepancies between the Fourteen Points and the Versailles Treaty. But no responsible person would insist that the Allies were under a binding obligation to make the treaty conform in every particular to Wilson's program.

By his ingenious tirades against Wilson, Hitler has tried to show the Germans that they were innocent victims caught in the web of a sinister world intrigue. He has attempted to prove that Germany could never again rely on "Allied promises." He has sought to convince the world that Germany was wronged and that her grievances should be redressed. By stressing "non-fulfilment," he played upon the world's sense of fair play, thereby conditioning opinion to serve his future policy.

Hitler capitalized on Wilson's principle of self-determination to realize his program of a Greater Germany. But he was not interested in the concept of nationality for its own sake. When it no longer served his ends, he pitched it onto the ash-heap and substituted the doctrine of Lebensraum.

Not Guilty

When in November 1918 the German people, trusting in the assurances given to them by President Wilson, laid down their arms under the agreement concluded at Compiègne, they held then, just as they do now, to the inner and absolutely unshakable conviction that they were not responsible for the outbreak of the war. Even the signature to a statement of Germany's guilt which was forced from weak men against their better knowledge does not alter this fact. Hence the vast majority of the German people then firmly believed that the laying down of their arms meant not only the end of the war but also the prevention of any similar calamity for the future as far as could be humanly foreseen. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1934; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1934)

Contrary to Wilson's Intentions

The present idea of collective cooperation among the nations is essentially and fundamentally the spiritual property of the American President Wilson. The policies of the pre-war period were determined rather by the idea of separate alliances of nations brought together by common interests. Rightly or wrongly, this policy was at one time held responsible for the outbreak of the World War. The termination of the war—at least as far as Germany is concerned—was hastened by the doctrine of Wilson's Fourteen Points and the three points that supplemented them later. In essence these points embraced the following ideas for preventing the recurrence of a similar catastrophe to mankind. The peace should not be a peace of unilateral rights but of general equality and therefore of universal justice. It should be a peace of reconciliation, of general disarmament, and thereby of general security. The crowning achievement of this idea was international collective collaboration of all states and nations within a League of Nations. I should like at this juncture to reaffirm that no nation greeted these ideas more eagerly at the time of the war than Germany. Her sufferings and sacrifices were far more severe than those of any other nation which had taken part in the war. It was in reliance upon these promises that the German soldiers laid down their arms.

When in 1919 the Peace of Versailles was dictated to the German people, the death sentence was thereby pronounced upon collective collaboration. For where there should have been equality for all, the

nations were classified into victors and vanquished. Instead of equal rights there was discrimination between those with rights and those without rights. Instead of general reconciliation there was punishment of the defeated, instead of international disarmament, the disarmament of the vanquished. Instead of general security there was security for the victors.

Yet even in the dictated Peace of Versailles it was expressly provided that the disarmament of Germany should be carried out first to enable the other powers to disarm likewise. Here we are afforded an example of the extent to which the idea of collective collaboration has been violated by those who are today its loudest protagonists.

Germany fulfilled almost fanatically the requirements imposed upon her by the Peace Treaty; financially to the utter derangement of her finances; economically to the total destruction of her economic life; and in national defense to the point of absolute defenselessness. . . . Germany for her part fairly renounced herself in order to pave the way for collective collaboration, as it was conceived by the President of the United States. . . . The rest of the world, however, not only failed to follow this example; it even retained its war stock at the same figure and in addition it continually supplemented, improved, and increased its war stock. . . .

Thus they [the signatories of the treaty] did what was absolutely contrary not only to President Wilson's intentions, but also—in the opinion of the most prominent representatives of the other side—contrary to the obligations to which they had subscribed in the Treaty of Versailles. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

Where Are the Fourteen Points?

You will all understand my thoughts if I ask you in this festive hour to lift your eyes above this hall and take a look at the great world beyond the German people. Unrest and insecurity are the most essential features of such a view. Right is weak and pretense rules the world. But woe to him who is weak himself! The stronger will take his possessions from him and use them as the grounds of a moral argument to justify his subjugation. While slaves are made, slaves are emancipated. While classes are annihilated, classes are born. The Marxist theorists who preached the doctrine of "Never War Again" are now constructing the greatest instrument for war. The apostles of international conciliation are filling the world with the most intolerant

hatred and the most infamous provocations among the nations. Those who have signed alliances of peace are studying the possibilities and methods of the coming war. In short, the man who is forced to walk defenseless in such a garden of dragons has good reason to feel ill at ease. For fifteen years our people had this experience of being delivered over to mercy or destruction at the hands of every comer, whether of good will or of evil will. We have been given the opportunity of proving by practical experience the value of sympathies extended to a person who, when once down, would still hope for justice or at least understanding. Where are Wilson's Fourteen Points and where is the world of today? (Nuremberg, Sept. 11, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 12, 1935)

Victims of Magic Theses

When in the gray November days of the year 1918 the curtain fell on the bloody tragedy of the Great War, millions of people in the entire world heaved a sigh of relief. Like a breath of spring the hope spread among the nations that therewith not only one of the saddest wars in human history had reached its end, but that a period rife with errors and, therefore, a disastrous period, had run its historic course.

Amid all the tumult of war, savage threats, accusations, execrations, and condemnations, the ideas of the President of the United States had reached the ears of mankind. They bespoke new times and a better world. In all, seventeen points in outline form were presented to the nations upon which to build a new order for the peoples of mankind. Whatever objection may be made against these points, they doubtless had one thing in their favor, namely, the recognition that a mere mechanical restoration of former conditions, institutions, and the views that went with them, would but lead within a short time to the same consequences then prevalent.

The magic of these theses lay in the fact that they, with incontestable nobility of purpose, endeavored to formulate new laws for international relations; that they tried to inspire those relations with a new spirit, out of which might emerge and develop that institution called the League of Nations, which would not only weld the various peoples together outwardly, but above all would bring them inwardly closer together in mutual respect and understanding. No people succumbed more completely to the magic power of this fantasy than the German people. They had the honor of being compelled to fight

against the whole world and the misfortune to have lost the struggle. As the vanquished foe, Germany was burdened with the curse of the responsibility for a struggle which the German people had neither anticipated nor desired. The German people believed in these theses with the strength of one despairing of himself and the world. Thus they trod the path into their most sorrowful period. We were all for many years victims of this fantastic faith and therewith objects of its disastrous consequences. (Berlin, March 7, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 8, 1936)

The Right to Self-Determination

Over 10,000,000 Germans live in two of the states adjoining our frontiers. Till 1866 they were constitutionally united with the whole German people. They fought up to 1918 in the Great War shoulder to shoulder with the German soldiers of the Reich. Under the terms of the peace they were kept against their will from forming a union with the Reich. This in itself is sufficiently distressing. There can, however, be no doubt about one thing. The fact that they are now citizens of other states does not deprive them of their natural rights as members of a national community. A people has the right to self-determination, as we were solemnly assured in Wilson's Fourteen Points which served as the basis of the Armistice; this cannot be overlooked simply because the people in question happen to be Germans! In the long run it is intolerable for a self-respecting world power to know that across the frontier are kinsmen who have to suffer severe persecution simply because of their sympathy, their feeling of union, and their common point of view with the whole German people. Of course, we realize that a frontier settlement pleasing to all is scarcely possible in Europe. It should, therefore, be all the more important to avoid unnecessary humiliation of national minorities. It is quite enough that they must be separated from their homeland without adding to this the pain of persecution for belonging to a different national community. It has been proved that with good will it is possible to find ways of compensation, that is, of relieving the tension. If one tries to prevent solution of the problem in this way and uses force in so doing, then some day violence will be returned with violence. We cannot dispute the fact that as long as Germany was feeble and powerless, she simply had to endure these persecutions of Germans across her frontiers. Just as England looks after her interests which cover a

large part of the world, so also will the Germany of today look after her comparatively restricted interests. And to these interests of the German Reich belongs also the protection of fellow-Germans who live beyond our frontiers and are unable to insure for themselves personal, political, and ideological freedom. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

A People Without Rights

In the past century a new ideal took the place of an earlier, tribally limited, denominationally conditioned, and dynastically established concept of the state and mode of the life of peoples. The principle of nationalism prescribed the goal for this age of our more recent history. It allowed political forms arising from earlier conditions to collapse and demanded, in conformity with the new ideal, the establishment of European national states. By the turn of the century a number of states had already succeeded in giving their movement for national unification suitable political expression. Other nations bore this ideal as the binding principle of their endeavors throughout the fiercest war of all times until final fulfillment was manifested.

The German people was the only people of Europe to whom this most natural of rights had been previously denied by fate and to whom it was to be definitely denied by the newly established order. Regional differences, denominational dismemberment, and dynastic selfishness had hitherto hindered the German people from achieving the political unity which it had sought for generations. The World War and its results increased German dismemberment and added to all other misfortunes the sorrow of racial separation of valuable parts of our nation from the mother country. Instead of the Wilsonian principle of self-determination, on the basis of which our people laid down their arms, there came a most brutal violation of many millions of Germans. The rights accorded as a matter of course to the most primitive colonial tribes were denied to one of the world's old cultural nations for reasons as untenable as they are insulting.

In my speech of February 20th, I already explained that there can hardly be a universally satisfactory solution of the national territorial problems of Europe. That is to say, it is not our idea that it should be the aim of a national administration by protest or negotiations to make territorial demands on all sides, demands which, though motivated by national necessities, in the end still would not lead to justice for the European nations as a whole. Countless racial enclaves

in Europe make it, to a certain extent, simply impossible to find a boundary which will be equally just to all the racial and national interests. There are, however, political edifices which bear the character of conscious and intentional national injustice so strongly that in the long run their maintenance will be possible only by the exercise of the most brutal force.

The creation of the new rump state of Austria was, for example, a measure which necessitated gross violation of the rights of self-determination of 6,500,000 human beings belonging to the German nation. This violation was admitted with cynical frankness. To the noted inventors of the rights of self-determination, of independence and freedom of peoples, as well as to the ubiquitous, pious world-governors (who at other times pretend to be so concerned about justice on this earth) it meant nothing at the time that through the so-called Peace Treaty they strangled the free will of 6,500,000 persons and compelled them by force to accept the loss of their right of self-determination and to endure unnatural separation from the great common mother-country. Indeed, despite this, when they decided in Austria to undertake plebiscites for union with Germany (here I should like especially to refresh the memories of the gentlemen democrats in London and Paris that this was a time when National Socialism did not exist either in Germany or in Austria) and when these votes were ninety-five per cent for union, then even this peaceful demonstration of the true will of the unhappy people, separated from their nation, was summarily forbidden by the apostles of the new right of peoples, simply by using the power of brutal force. (Berlin, March 18, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 19, 1938)

Millions of Germans Violated

Among the majority of nationalities being suppressed in this state [Czechoslovakia] there are 3,500,000 Germans, that is, about as many people of our race as, for example, there are inhabitants of Denmark. Now these Germans are likewise creatures of God. The Almighty did not create them in order that they should be surrendered by a political edifice set up at Versailles to a foreign power that is odious to them. He did not create the 7,000,000 Czechs that they should supervise and act as guardians to 3,500,000 human beings, much less violate and torment them.

It is generally known that the conditions in this state are unbearable. In the name of Mr. Wilson's principle of self-determination,

7,500,000 people are robbed here of their political self-determination. Economically these people are being systematically ruined and thereby subjected to a slow process of extermination. The misery of the Sudeten Germans is inexpressible; the Czechs wish to annihilate them. They are being suppressed unbearably and treated disgracefully. . . .

Mr. Benes indulges in tactics. He talks and wants to organize negotiations on the lines of Geneva to clear up questions of procedure and to make small concessions. This cannot go on forever! This is not a matter of phrases, but of rights, and, indeed, of violated rights. What the Germans demand is self-determination, which every other people also possesses, and not phrases. Mr. Benes is not in the position to offer anything to the Sudeten Germans. They have a right to claim a life of their own, just as every other people.

If the democracies should be convinced that they must in this case screen the oppression of Germans with all the means at their disposal, then this will produce grave consequences. I believe that I am serving peace the more if I do not leave any doubt about this. I have not claimed that Germany may oppress 3,500,000 French or that 3,500,000 English shall be surrendered to Germany for oppression; but I do demand that the oppression of 3,500,000 Germans in Czechoslovakia cease and be replaced by the free right of self-determination. (Nuremberg, Sept. 12, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 13, 1938)

A Trust Betrayed

You know that at one time the German people too, thanks to the slogan "self-determination of peoples," were imbued with a belief in super-political assistance and accordingly renounced to the utmost the utilization of its own strength. You know that this trust of those days was most shamefully betrayed. The result was the Versailles Treaty, and you all remember its frightful consequences. You remember how our people first were robbed of their weapons and how, disarmed then, they were later mistreated. You know the terrible fate that befell us for a decade and a half. . . .

In 1918 under the slogan "the right of self-determination of nations," Central Europe was torn up and reshaped by some insane so-called statesmen. Without regard for the origin of peoples, for their national wishes, or their economic necessities, they smashed up Europe and arbitrarily set up so-called new states. To this procedure Czechoslovakia owes its existence. This Czech state began with one single lie, and the father of this erstwhile lie is Benes. This Mr. Benes at that

time turned up at Versailles and assured them, to begin with, that there was a Czechoslovak nation. He had to invent this lie to give the insignificant number of his own nationals somewhat larger and thereby more legitimate dimensions. And those Anglo-Saxon statesmen, not very adequately versed in geographical and national aspects, did not think it necessary at that time to put Mr. Benes' assertions to a test. Otherwise they would have been able to determine at once that there is no Czechoslovak nation, but that there are only Czechs and Slovaks, and that the Slovaks prefer to have nothing to do with the Czechs. . . .

So at last the Czechs through Mr. Benes annexed Slovakia. As this state did not appear capable of survival, 3,500,000 Germans were simply unceremoniously taken over against their right of self-determination and their will to self-determination. Since this did not suffice, over 1,000,000 Magyars had to be added, then the Carpatho-Russians and at last several hundred thousand Poles. This is the state, then, which later called itself Czechoslovakia—in contradiction to the right of self-determination of nations and in contradiction to the clear wish and will of the violated nations. As I here talk to you, I naturally feel sympathy for the fate of all these oppressed; I feel sympathy for the fate of the Slovaks, the Poles, the Hungarians, the Ukrainians; naturally, however, I am spokesman only for the fate of my Germans. . . .

Accordingly I made my demand at Nuremberg. It was quite clear. There, for the first time, I said that at last, nearly twenty years after the declarations of President Wilson, the right of self-determination for these 3,500,000 must be enforced. Again Mr. Benes replied with new victims, new imprisonments, new arrests. The German element had to flee. . . . I am spokesman for the Germans, and for those Germans I have now spoken and given assurance that I am no longer willing to watch quietly and passively while this lunatic in Prague goes on believing that he can mishandle 3,500,000 human beings. I left no doubt about it that a characteristic of our German mentality is to accept things for a long time and with increasing patience, but that a moment comes when we have had enough. . . .

I want now to declare before the German people that as regards the Sudeten German problem my patience is at last exhausted. I have made an offer to Mr. Benes that is nothing else than a realization of what he himself has already conceded. He now holds the decision in his hand. Peace or war! Either he will now accept this offer and at last give the Germans their freedom, or we will take this freedom for ourselves! (Berlin, Sept. 26, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 27, 1938)

Austria Liberated

Among the Fourteen Points which the American President Wilson also promised Germany in the name of all the other Allies as the basis on which a new world peace was to be established when Germany laid down her arms, was the fundamental principle of the self-determination of peoples. The peoples were not simply to be transferred like chattels from one sovereignty to another by the arts of diplomacy, but in the name of the most sacred natural rights were to determine for themselves the course of their lives and their political existence.

The proclamation of this principle might have been of fundamental importance. Actually, during the following period, the Allied Powers of the day also applied these theories when they could make them serve their own selfish purposes. Thus they refused to return Germany's colonial possessions, alleging that it would be wrong to return the native inhabitants of the colonies to Germany against their will. Of course in 1918 no one took the trouble to find out what their will was. But while the Allies, in the name of the right of self-determination, appeared as the defenders of primitive Negro tribes, they refused in 1918 to grant to the highly civilized German people the rights of man which had previously been solemnly promised to them. Many millions of German citizens were torn from the Reich against their will, or prevented from uniting with it. Indeed, in sharpest contrast to the promise of the right of self-determination, the Peace Treaty of Versailles even forbade the union of the Germans of the *Ostmark* [Austria] with the Reich at a moment when efforts were being made in Austria to give practical expression to the right of self-determination through public plebiscites.

All efforts to bring about a change in the situation through the recommended method of reasonable revision had hitherto failed, and were bound to fail in the future, in view of the well-known attitude of the Versailles Powers. Indeed, the articles dealing with revision in the Covenant of the League of Nations had only a platonic significance.

I myself, as a son of the *Ostmark*, was filled with the sacred wish to solve this problem and thus lead my homeland back to the Reich. In January 1938 I finally resolved that in the course of that year, in one way or another, I would fight for and win the right of self-determination for the 6,500,000 Germans in Austria. I invited Herr Schuschnigg, then Chancellor of Austria, to an interview at Berchtesgaden, and assured him that the German Reich would no longer tolerate any further oppression of these German comrades. I therefore suggested

that he should give closer consideration to a final solution of this problem by means of a reasonable and equitable agreement. I left no doubt in his mind that otherwise freedom, in accordance with the principles of the right of self-determination, would be forcibly obtained for those 6,500,000 Germans by other means. The result was an agreement which permitted me to hope for a solution of this difficult problem by means of a general understanding. In my Reichstag speech of February 22nd, I stated that the Reich could no longer be indifferent to the fate of 10,000,000 Germans in Central Europe who were separated from the motherland against their will. I stated that, above all, further oppression and mistreatment of these Germans would lead to the most energetic counter measures.

A few days later Herr Schuschnigg decided to violate in a glaring manner the agreement which he had entered into at Berchtesgaden. His aim was to destroy the legal basis of the national right of self-determination and to destroy the will of these 6,500,000 Germans to that right by means of an insane election fraud. On the evening of Wednesday, March 9th, I learned of this intention through Schuschnigg's speech at Innsbruck. That night I ordered the mobilization of a number of infantry and mechanized divisions, and issued the order to march immediately across the frontier on Saturday, March 12th at 8 a.m., to liberate the *Ostmark*. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Broken Commitments

The war, in which Germany found herself involved purely as a result of a mistaken interpretation of loyalty to an ally, ended after more than four years with that fantastic proclamation of the famous American President Wilson. These Fourteen Points, which were supplemented by four additional principles, represent the solemn commitments of the Allied Powers, on the basis of which Germany laid down her arms. After the Armistice these commitments were broken in the most infamous manner. Then began the insane efforts of the victor states to transform the sufferings of the war into a permanent war in peace-time. If for the most part an end had been put to this condition today, this has not happened because the democratic statesmen have displayed insight or even a sense of fairness, but solely through the strength of the reawakened German nation. It is in any case a fact that at the end of the war any rational consideration would have shown that no state had visibly profited. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Stolen Colonies

The entire conduct of the so-called victor Powers after the end of the war was completely irrational and irresponsible. The theft of the German colonies was morally unjustified. Economically, it was utter insanity. The political motives advanced were so mean that one is tempted to call them silly. In 1918, after the end of the war the victorious Powers really would have had the authority to bring about a reasonable settlement of international problems. . . .

The great German colonial possessions, which the Reich once acquired peacefully by treaties and by paying for them, have been stolen—contrary indeed to the solemn assurance given by President Wilson, which was the basic condition on which Germany laid down her arms. The objection that these colonial possessions are of no importance in any case should only lead to their being returned to us with an easy mind. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

The World's Greatest Breach of Faith

When Wilson's Fourteen Points were announced, many German *Volksgenossen* and, above all, the leading men of the time saw in these Fourteen Points not only the possibility of ending the World War but also of a final pacification of all the nations on this earth.

There was to be a peace of reconciliation and understanding, a peace that was to know neither victors nor vanquished, a peace without war indemnities, a peace of equal rights for all, a peace of equal distribution of colonial territory and of equal consideration of colonial desires. It was to be a peace which would be finally crowned by a league of all free nations. This peace, because it was to be the guarantor of equal rights, would make it appear superfluous to peoples in the future to support the armaments which heretofore, as it was affirmed, had been so burdensome. There was to be disarmament, and, to be sure, disarmament of all nations. Germany was to serve as a good example by taking the lead and all the others were obligated to follow her disarmament.

Then, too, the era of so-called secret diplomacy was also to be ended. All problems henceforth were to be discussed and negotiated openly and freely. Above all, however, the right of self-determination of nations was to be finally established and exalted as the most important factor. Germany believed in these assurances. With faith in these

declarations, Germany laid down her weapons. And then a breach of faith began such as world history had never seen before. As soon as our people laid down their arms, a period of suppression, of blackmailing, of plundering, and of slavery began. No longer any word about "peace without victors and vanquished," but a judgment of condemnation for the vanquished for endless time. No longer any word concerning equal rights, but rights for one side, and injustice and outlawry for the other. Robbery upon robbery, extortion upon extortion, were the consequences.

No person in this democratic world bothered himself about the suffering of our people. Hundreds of thousands fell in the war, not because of enemy action, but because of the hunger blockade. When the war ended, this blockade was continued for months in order to oppress our people still more. Even a German prisoner of war had to remain in captivity for an endless length of time. The German colonies were stolen from us; German holdings were simply seized; and our merchant marine taken away. In addition there came financial plundering such as the world had never before seen. Payments were imposed upon the German people which reached astronomical figures. Concerning these figures an English statesman said that they could only be met if the entire German people reduced its standard of living to the utmost and if they worked fourteen hours every day.

That which German genius and German diligence had produced and saved through decades and decades was now lost in a few years. Millions of Germans were torn away from the Reich; others were prevented from returning to the Reich. The League of Nations did not become an instrument of a just policy of understanding but a guarantor of the meanest dictate that mankind has ever devised. A great people was thus violated and led towards the misery that you all well know. A great people was cheated of its rights by a broken pledge, and its existence was made practically impossible. . . .

The greatest breach of faith of all time was committed against us Germans. Let us take care that our people at home will never again break down, then no one in the world will ever be able to threaten us. Then our people will either maintain peace or, if necessary, enforce peace. Then our people will flourish and prosper. (Wilhelmshaven, April 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 3, 1939)

A Most Holy Task

Not only was the German Reich destroyed and Austria split up into its component parts by the criminals of Versailles, but Germans were also forbidden to acknowledge that community which they had confessed for more than a thousand years. I have always regarded the elimination of this state of affairs as the highest and holiest task of my life. I have never failed to proclaim this determination, and I have always been resolved to realize these ideas which have haunted me night and day.

I should have sinned against the mission which Providence designed for me, had I failed in my own endeavor to lead my native country and my German people of the *Ostmark* back to the Reich and thus to the community of the German people. In doing so, moreover, I have wiped out the most disgraceful aspect of the Treaty of Versailles. I have once more established the right of self-determination and done away with the democratic oppression of 7,500,000 Germans. I have removed the ban which prevented them from voting on their own fate, and carried out this vote before the whole world. The result was not only what I had expected, but also precisely what had been anticipated by the democratic oppressors of Versailles. For what other reasons did they stop the plebiscite on the question of *Anschluss*? (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

Britain's Warm Supporter

They [the Allies of World War I] even went further and maintained that they were not fighting at all for victory but for peace with understanding, peace with reconciliation, and, above all, peace with equality of rights. This peace was to make it possible for nations to renounce the use of arms in the future. Thus they were really fighting against war. Britain fought against war in order to end wars, that is to say, wars fought by the other side, and resistance on the part of victims of aggression. They said that it was consequently out of the question that Britain would demand indemnities. On the contrary, they desired a peace without reparations, a peace marked by general disarmament, and establishment of an institution uniting all nations.

All this President Wilson, Britain's warm supporter, set forth in Fourteen Points to which three more were added. These points assured us that we had nothing to fear, that no unjust treatment would

be meted out to us, and that we need only place our confidence in Britain and lay down our arms in order to be received into a true community of nations in which justice would prevail. These points further asserted that the colonies would be justly distributed and every justified colonial claim would receive due consideration. All this was to be rendered sacrosanct by the League of Nations. War would be finally abolished and the millenium would begin. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 10, 1939)

Wilson's Insolent Lies

The years 1914-1918 have proved one thing—our foes were not victorious. It was a despicable revolt, plotted by Marxist-Center-Liberalistic-Capitalist elements. The eternal Jew was the driving force behind them; it was they who caused Germany's downfall. Today, we know from English statements that in 1918 the English were facing their own collapse when—perhaps in the last quarter of the twelfth hour the German revolt at last materialized. This was aided by the cowardice of those governing Germany at the time, their indecision, vacillation and uncertainty. Thus it was possible that the first World War was lost, not through any merits of our enemies, but solely through our own fault. The result of Germany's collapse in November, however, was not that world democracy received her with open arms and tried to free the German people from its burdens, to elevate the German people to a higher cultural level—this our enemies could not do, being on a low level themselves—the result was, in fact, the most terrible political and economic collapse ever experienced by any nation. Then a man confronted us who inflicted untold harm on the German people. It was Woodrow Wilson, the man who with brazen insolence lied that Germany, if she laid down her arms, would be granted a peace of conciliation and understanding, would not be deprived of her colonies, for colonial problems would be righteously settled. The man went on to lie that general disarmament was to come, that we were to be admitted into a League of Nations, each of equal status and right, and so on. He went on lying that secret diplomacy would be abolished, and that we were moving towards a new era of peace, equal rights, reason, and the like. The minion of this arch liar was Roosevelt; he was his right-hand man. . . .

Thus came the hour of the most bitter disappointment when the German emissaries stepped before the carriage at Compiègne—the place which we know now—and were there rebuffed with the gruff

question: What do these gentlemen want here? It was an armistice which, in point of fact, really meant that the German people were rendered completely defenseless, and the peace afterwards was the complete disarming of our nation, and, hand in hand with this, our nation was deprived of all its rights, was exploited and pillaged by a plot of international finance. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1942; B.B.C.)

History's Biggest Fraud

International Jewry has always been a past master in the art of sowing discord between peoples and nations. In the World War of 1914-1918 this international coalition of business profiteers, with their Jewish wire-pullers, succeeded in befogging the German people with their empty words and in blinding it by threatening danger. When the German people, weakened at home by revolution, later laid down their arms, simple-minded people, relying on the promises of these faithless enemies, thought they could expect a peace based on justice, reconciliation, and good-will.

From that day onward the name of the President of the United States is connected for all time with the biggest fraud in world history which followed. By undermining the morale of the German people, unconquered on the field of battle, he made possible its destruction. At the same time Wilson has forever rendered the German nation immune against the repetition of any such attempts. From that time onward the word of an American President counts for no more, at any rate to the German people, than in the United States, that is to say, precisely nothing. . . .

Had the German nation in the year 1918, instead of putting its faith in Wilson's lying and hypocritical phrases, continued to conduct the fight with iron determination, the enemy world surrounding us would have collapsed then. (Eastern front, Jan. 1, 1943; *New York Times*, Jan. 3, 1943)

15

Bolshevik Bugaboo

Had the German Reich sunk into Bolshevik chaos it would have plunged the whole of western civilization into a crisis of inconceivable magnitude.

Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939

The Bolshevik colossus of which we are only now beginning to know the horrible menace, must never—and this is our unrelenting resolve—encroach again upon the blessed lands of Europe.

Berlin, March 15, 1942

Hitler has always been at his grisly best when denouncing Bolshevism. His thesis runs as follows: Bolshevism must be destroyed if Europe is to escape political and economic perdition. The Bolsheviks are bloodthirsty apostles of chaos who seek to overthrow Western civilization and plunge it into Asiatic barbarism. Since it is the mission of National Socialism to prevent such an appalling catastrophe, the Nazis and Communists are deadly enemies.

By raising the bugaboo of Bolshevism, Hitler has not only endeavored to arouse fear and apprehension but also to justify and promote National Socialism. Moreover, his tirades have been designed to appeal to vested interests and conservative elements at home as well as abroad. Addressing himself to the French bourgeoisie, British conservatives, and American capitalists, he has sought to enlist their support by exaggerating the menace of Marxism.

By building up Russia as world enemy number one, Hitler intended, of course, to isolate her and thus destroy any system of security between the East and West. In addition, he has used the Bolshevik crusade to camouflage German rearmament and justify German expansion.

Hitler's pact with Stalin on August 23, 1939, completely reversed his principles and destroyed once and for all the myth of his guardianship of the West against Bolshevism. Suddenly Russia was no longer the terrifying world menace. The Fuehrer discovered an "identity of interests" with the "barbarous" Reds and began to talk of Russo-German cooperation. These Machiavellian gestures were matched only by the German invasion of the U.S.S.R. in June, 1941, which proved that the original pact had been merely another Nazi hoax. Once the war against the Soviets was under way, Hitler lost no time in reviving hatred toward Russia. His purpose now was to rally Germany and her misguided satellites for the final showdown against the "Eastern menace" and to drive a wedge between Russia and the Allies. Although he had been almost too successful in his earlier divisive campaign, his second series of attacks was foredoomed to failure. By this time, the Western world knew that every note in his propaganda chorus was a noisome lie.

The Red Dragon Threatens

You will remember I said . . . that the opinion that Marxism was finished, was madness and insanity, that it required extreme stupidity to believe in this madness. I said that we could not get by without a final clash and that the final clash would not come someday in Parliament, but that there would be a showdown as the result of which one of us would be destroyed—either Marxism or we. Since then more than a year has passed and while I am talking to you, they are getting ready in all of Germany to celebrate the day of the Red frontfighters in Berlin, where 90,000 to 120,000 such Red frontfighters are expected to parade. . . .

You do not find that Communism is being subdued but rather that it is being radicalized; there is not a weakening of Marxism, but an undeniable strengthening of it. The bourgeois parties are responsible that today, after seven years, we are not standing, as might be expected, beside the corpse of Communism, but beside our own coffin. That is the result of the measures taken by these know-alls, and also the result of the ban on public speaking. The gentlemen [the Bavarian Government] who forbade me as well as many deputies to speak, and who therewith gagged our Movement, have forgotten that the Bavarian People's Party has so far been unable to eliminate Marxism. . . .

Never will these gentlemen be able to justify themselves before German history for what they have done with this ban on public speaking. They tried to paralyze the one party that would have been able to give opposition to this Red pest. How do they picture further developments in Germany? In 1919 Berlin did not have even 20,000 Communists; in 1920 there were already 67,000, in 1923 140,000, in the first election in 1924 more than 200,000, and at the last election the same year 357,000. Today we may be convinced that there are far more than 600,000 to 700,000 Communists in Berlin. In other cities it is undoubtedly much the same as in the capital of the German Reich. How do people imagine a German future, as long as this increase is not checked? They are giving up any kind of a German future.

Here in Bavaria of course we have the wonderful prescription of bringing out the Royalists (*Koenigsmacher*) as soon as the Red dragon lifts its head and softly begins to blow steam from its nostrils. Just as once upon a time Pope Leo went out to meet the hordes of Attila and calmed them by his majestic appearance, so some day Professor Bauer will go out to meet the Asiatic hordes, umbrella and

royal crown in hand, and will cause this movement which extends from Vladivostok to Koenigsberg to stop at the sight of war-veteran associations and soldier organizations, who are marching with flying banners and exclaim incessantly, "Hail to our king, hail!"—this in order to frighten away the dreadful hordes. . . .

The Red mob is threatening in Berlin and down here we are talking about monarchy! My dear friends! If something should really happen today, I cannot see how our war-veteran organizations, armed with nothing but umbrellas, would take up the fight, how those who were outdone so quickly in 1918 would suddenly be able to out-yell the international Marseillaise. These gentlemen are lulling themselves into beautiful dreams. They claim that we are endangering the state. No, they themselves are endangering the state. They claim that we are trying to eliminate the state by force. No, they themselves are doing away with the state by breaking that force which alone, through its enlightenment, can take steps against the Red mob. If today it should come to a decision, the war-veterans organizations will not be the ones to decide the issue; only a fanatic will that is burned into one can meet the attack, a will which those gentlemen do not have. The claim that we are endangering the state is an incredible lie. All these years we have done nothing but fight for the German Reich and the German State. . . . For many years we have fought to the utmost for the good of the German people. But the time will come when these gentlemen will be looking for allies. They will realize that they were not able to overcome Bolshevism. . . .

With this I come to our mission in these times. It is our mission now to forge a strong weapon—namely, will and energy—so that when the hour comes and the Red dragon raises itself to strike, at least a part of our people will not give up and despair, but will be determined to resist it. . . . We do not want to fight the German Reich or the state, but those getting ready to strike it down. Thus I am standing for exactly the same principles that I stood for already a year ago. We are convinced that a final showdown will come in this fight against Marxism. We are convinced that it must come, for two *Weltanschauungen* are fighting each other and there can be only one outcome! One will be destroyed and the other will win. . . . It is the great mission of the National Socialist Movement, to give this epoch a new faith and to see to it that millions will swear by this faith, so that, when some day the hour for the showdown comes, the German people will not meet the Jewish international murderers completely unarmed. (Munich, May 23, 1926; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 26, 1926)

Destiny's Turning Point

We see . . . that, parallel with the gradual confusion in the thinking of the white race in Europe, a *Weltanschauung* has established a hold in a part of Europe and a large part of Asia, which threatens to dislodge this continent from the framework of international economic relations altogether. This is a phenomenon which German statesmen even today disregard with amazing levity. When, for example, I hear a speech in which it is emphasized that it is necessary for the German people to stand together, then I have to ask the question: Does one actually believe that this standing together is today merely a question of political good will?

Is it not evident that a rift has already opened up among us, a rift which is not just the brainstorm of a few, but whose spiritual exponent forms today the basis of one of the greatest World Powers? Is it not evident that Bolshevism is not merely a mob raging around in the streets in Germany, but that it is a conception of life which is on the verge of conquering the whole of Asia and which in the form of a state reaches almost from our eastern frontier to Vladivostok?

In Germany the situation is represented as though it were merely the question of purely abstract problems on the part of a few evil-intentioned individuals. No! A *Weltanschauung* has conquered a state, and emanating from this state it will slowly shatter the entire world and bring about its collapse. Bolshevism, if unchecked, will change the world as completely as Christianity once did. Three hundred years from now it will no longer be said that it is a question of a new idea in production. Three hundred years from now the world will perhaps know that it is practically a question of a new religion, even though a religion founded on a somewhat different basis [from Christianity]. If this movement continues to develop, Lenin, 300 years from now, will be regarded not only as one of the revolutionaries of 1917, but as the founder of a new world doctrine and he will be worshipped as much perhaps as Buddha. . . .

In any case if European and American thinking remains in the future what it is now, then Bolshevism will slowly spread over Asia. A period of thirty or fifty years does not matter, since it is a question of *Weltanschauung*. It was 300 years after Christ before Christianity slowly began to permeate all of Southern Europe, and 700 years later it also took hold in Northern Europe. *Weltanschauungen* of such a basic nature can, even 500 years after their establishment,

prove their ability to conquer, unless they are broken by the natural instinct of self-preservation of other peoples. If this process were to continue, however, even for only thirty, forty, or fifty years and our attitude still remains unchanged, then, gentlemen, we will no longer be able to say: What does that have to do with our economy? . . .

If it were not for us, there would not be a middle class in Germany anymore. Whether there would be Bolshevism or no Bolshevism would have been decided long ago. Take the weight of our gigantic organization—by far the greatest in this new Germany—out of the scales of national events, and you would see that without us Bolshevism would have already decided the issue by now. This is a fact which is proved best of all by the attitude of Bolshevism toward us. . . . Today we have reached the turning point of German destiny. If the present development continues, Germany will necessarily be immersed in Bolshevik chaos. (Duesseldorf, Jan. 27, 1932; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 19, 1932)

The Menace of Marxism

For fourteen or fifteen years I have continuously proclaimed to the German nation that I regard it as my task before posterity to destroy Marxism, and that is no empty phrase but a solemn oath which I shall follow as long as I live. I have made this confession of faith, the confession of faith of a single man, that of a mighty organization. I know now that even if fate were to remove me the fight would be fought to the end; this Movement is the guarantee for that. This for us is not a fight which can be finished by compromise. We see in Marxism the enemy of our people which we will root out and destroy without mercy. . . .

We must then fight to the very end those tendencies which have eaten into the soul of the German nation in the last seventeen years, which have done us such incalculable damage and which, if they had not been vanquished, would have destroyed Germany. Bismarck told us that liberalism was the pace-maker of Social Democracy. I need not say here that Social Democracy is the pace-maker of Communism. And Communism is the forerunner of death, of national destruction, and extinction. We have joined battle with it and will fight it to the death. (Berlin, May 10, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 11, 1933)

Diametric Opposites

The ideas by which we are governed are diametrically opposed to those of Soviet Russia. National Socialism is a doctrine which applies exclusively to the German people. Bolshevism lays emphasis on its international mission. We National Socialists believe that in the long run man can be happy only among his own people. We live in the belief that the happiness and the achievements of Europe are indissolubly connected with the existence of free, independent national states. Bolshevism preaches the constitution of a world empire and only recognizes sections of a central International. We National Socialists recognize that every people has the right to its own inner life according to its own needs and character. Bolshevism on the other hand sets up doctrinaire theories, to be accepted by all nations, without regard for their particular character, disposition, and traditions.

National Socialism strives to solve social problems, to alleviate tension, and to settle other questions in its own nation by methods which are compatible with our general human, spiritual, cultural and economic ideas, traditions and circumstances. Bolshevism preaches an international class conflict and the carrying out of a world revolution by means of terror and force. National Socialism aims at bridging over and equalizing unfavorable contrasts in social life and in uniting the whole population in collaborative work. Bolshevism teaches the overthrow of the rule of one class by means of a forcible dictatorship on the part of another class. National Socialism places no value upon the purely theoretical dominance of the working class but lays all the more value on the practical improvement of their conditions of life and way of living. Bolshevism fights for a theory, and to this theory it sacrifices millions of human beings and incalculable cultural and traditional values. In comparison with ourselves it achieves only a very low general standard of living.

As National Socialists we are filled with admiration and respect for the great achievements of the past, not only in our own nation but far beyond its borders as well. We are happy to belong to the European community of culture which has inspired the modern world to so large an extent. Bolshevism rejects this cultural achievement of humanity and asserts that real culture and human history began with the year in which Marxism was born. We National Socialists may perhaps not have the same views as our church communities in respect to this or that question of organization. But we never want to see a lack of religion and faith and do not want our churches turned

into clubrooms and cinemas. Bolshevism teaches godlessness and acts accordingly.

We National Socialists see in private property a higher degree of human economic development which regulates the administration of rewards in proportion to the differences in achievement, but which in general makes possible and guarantees to all the advantages of a higher standard of living. Bolshevism destroys not only private property but also private initiative and the zest for personal responsibility. In this way it has failed to save millions of men from starvation in Russia, the greatest agrarian state in the world. The results of such a catastrophe in Germany would be inconceivable. In Russia there are ninety people living on the land to only ten living in the cities, whereas in Germany there are only twenty-five peasants to every seventy-five city dwellers.

One might go on with all this interminably. Both we National Socialists and the Bolsheviks are convinced that there is a gulf between us which can never be bridged. Moreover, there are more than 400 murdered National Socialists between us. Thousands of National Socialists have fallen in other organizations to forestall a Bolshevik revolt. Thousands of soldiers and policemen have been shot and massacred in the fight for the protection of the Reich and the states from the everlasting Communist uprisings, and more than 43,000 members of the National Socialist Party have been wounded. Thousands of them have been either blinded or crippled for life. Insofar as Bolshevism can be considered a purely Russian affair, we have no interest in it whatever. Every nation must seek its salvation in its own way. So far as Bolshevism draws Germany within its range, however, we are its deadliest and most fanatical enemies. . . .

I began my activities in Germany at about the same time that Bolshevism celebrated its first success in Germany, that is, about the time of the first civil war in Germany. After fifteen years Bolshevism counted 6,000,000 adherents in our country. By that time the number of my adherents, however, had risen to 13,000,000. Bolshevism was defeated in a decisive struggle. National Socialism has saved Germany, and perhaps all Europe, from the most frightful catastrophe of all time. If the West-European critics of this idea had the same practical experience as I have had, then I believe that they would perhaps come to quite different conclusions than those which they hold at the present time. If, however, my struggle in Germany had been a failure and the Bolshevik revolt had overwhelmed Germany, then I know that the greatness of our historic achievement would be

understood. As things now stand my part seems to be that of an admonisher who is perhaps laughed at by the rest of the world. But so far as Germany is concerned, I must, in accordance with my conscience and my position of responsibility, make the following statement. The Communist uprisings and revolts in Germany could never have taken place without moral and material preparations of world Bolshevism. The most prominent leaders of this movement were not only trained and financed in Russia for their revolutionary activities in Germany, but they received public honors and decorations and were even appointed as commanders of Russian troops. These are facts. (Berlin, May 21, 1935; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 22, 1935)

Starvation and Slaughter

We declined this [Bolshevik] teaching in favor of the more humane philosophy with which we approach our fellowman. The presentations of our speakers at our Party conference, as well as the events in Spain, again have given the world and our German *Volks-genossen* an insight into the cruelties of Bolshevik methods of fighting and of Bolshevik governmental principles. The German people is too good and too decent for such atrocities. . . .

We rejected and fought Bolshevism, not because it intended a revolution, but because its leaders intended a slaughter, such as took place once in Russia and now in Spain, and because we simply did not desire that our people for a second time should be ashamed of the history of their past. November 1918 has been guilty of enough here. The difference between the Bolshevik and the National Socialist Revolution is the fact that the one transforms fruitful countries into horrible fields of ruin, while the other transforms a destroyed and miserable Reich into a healthy state and into a prosperous economy. . . .

We rejected and fought Bolshevism for general economic reasons. At present the ghastly news of a new and catastrophic famine in Russia spreads throughout the world. Since the triumph of Bolshevism there is no end to this calamity. The Bolshevik hypocrites should not hold the weather, that is, God, responsible for their own sins, for this same Russia that has been vegetating now for almost twenty years was formerly one of the richest grain-producing countries of the world.

Eighteen times as much land as in Germany is available there per capita. What a miserable economic system it must be which cannot manage under such circumstances to let a people live decently! If Bolshevism in Russia is not successful in nourishing one person who

is not a peasant by the efforts of nine peasants, what would have happened in Germany—in a country in which two and a half peasants must provide seven and a half people who are not peasants with food-stuffs! We too suffer under the changing conditions of the weather, and much more so than Russia, for our arable land is so incomparably smaller and thereby much more affected by weather disturbances of the same extent. What would have become of Germany and its economy if the Jewish Bolshevik lack of management had also taken root here?

We fought Bolshevism because its triumph in Germany would have delivered perhaps forty, perhaps fifty per cent or more of our people to certain death by starvation. If Russia is not able to nourish eight people per square kilometer, then not even 10,000,000 in Germany would have the necessities of life under a Bolshevik regime. Our 68,000,000 live on the same area that is not even required to sustain 5,000,000 in Russia.

We rejected Bolshevism and fought Bolshevism because we are Socialists, and because by Socialism we do not understand the regime of a small group and the forced labor and the starvation of millions of others. Bolshevism sees in the workers an object just good enough to be led and exploited by its Jewish intellectual leaders, but too worthless ever to lead itself. Above all, we rejected Bolshevism and fought Bolshevism because by Socialism we do not understand the lowering of the standard of living of a people for the benefit of an unscrupulous Soviet bourgeoisie and an equally unscrupulous objective. Besides that, the German is so intelligent and the German worker is so well educated that the presumption that he must draw upon Russia for his guidance is an insult! Moscow remains Moscow, and Germany is Germany!

Finally, we fought Bolshevism because we do not want our people to be led to the slaughterhouse again someday for such objectives as those of the purely Jewish, Bolshevik, imperialistic interests. Bolshevism preached world-revolution and would have used the German people and the German worker solely as cannon fodder to obtain the goal of this world empire. But we National Socialists do not want our military forces used for the purpose of forcing something on other peoples which they themselves do not wish at all. Our army does not swear to advance the National Socialist idea to other peoples by means of the sword, but rather to defend with its own blood the National Socialist idea and therewith the German Reich, its security, and its freedom in the face of attack from other peoples. . . .

Let Bolshevism, which only a few months ago revealed that its

object is to build up its army in order to open the gate for revolution in other countries, if necessary by force,—let this Bolshevism realize that the new German Army stands before the gates of Germany. It would be foolish if we refused to consider the possibilities presented by a Bolshevik Revolution in Europe. Earlier, as party-leader, I often objectively and soberly discussed the intentions and views of Bolshevism and openly weighed them. At that time I saw its possible development correctly; to be sure, I also correctly established the National Socialist power. Before the whole German people I can, as *Fuehrer* of the state and therewith of the whole German nation, consider with the same sense of responsibility the dangers hovering over Europe today. . . .

The brutal mass butchery of Nationalist soldiers, the burning of Nationalist officers' wives, soaked with gasoline, the slaughter of children and babies of Nationalist parents, in Spain, for example, is supposed to be a warning, intended to intimidate the similarly disposed forces in other countries, against all resistance in a similar situation. Should these methods lead to their objective, and the modern Girondists again be followed by Jacobins, and should a people's front of Kerensky be followed by Bolshevism, then Europe will go down in a sea of blood and sorrow. European culture which, having developed from ancient times, now soon to have a history of two and a half thousand years, will be followed by the most horrible barbarity of all times.

I see this danger, and I do not belong to those who now in the face of it become faint and close their eyes and then no longer want to admit the truth of it. In view of this situation threatening human culture and civilization, I cannot disguise the depth of my inmost sympathy for those who in their countries either have abolished this danger or at least banished it. In the face of this danger I would like to make a most earnest appeal to the German people henceforth to take up again that battle order which we as National Socialists assumed fourteen years before taking over power. . . .

What we learn about the excesses of the Bolshevik murderers and anarchistic criminals does not surprise us National Socialists. We found them thus always and everywhere. If by contrast Germany today is a country of peace and happy order, we do not have a lifeless organization of our Party to thank for this, or its Storm-Troopers, but the National Socialist spirit which inspires them and therewith leads them to victory. What could be more important to us than

that in these threatening times we again should reflect upon this invincible ideological basis of our conduct and of our success?

No one can entertain a doubt that National Socialism everywhere and in all circumstances will defend itself against the attack of Bolshevism and will defeat and annihilate it. Since we know and believe this, we are able to measure the enormity of the task which may someday confront us. The old program of the Party then lives for us again, this program of honor, of social consciousness, of national morality, of fanatical fulfillment of duty, of readiness for sacrifice, as well as the unvarying resolve to act.

When in the past the reckoning with Bolshevism came to Germany, none of the old institutions decided the struggle. No! It was this Party, enlivened by the spirit of the National Socialist ideology, which put to rout the elements of dissolution and led the elements of order to victory. (Nuremberg, Sept. 14, 1936; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 15, 1936)

Deadly Poison

If Mr. Eden does not regard Bolshevism as we do, that may have something to do with the position of Great Britain and also with some events unknown to us. But I believe that no one will question the sincerity of our opinions on this matter, for they are not based on abstract theory alone. For Mr. Eden, Bolshevism is perhaps a thing which has its seat in Moscow, but for us in Germany this Bolshevism is a pestilence against which we have had to struggle at the cost of much bloodshed. It is a pestilence which tried to turn our country into the same kind of desert as is now the case in Spain, for the habit of murdering hostages began here, in the form in which we now see it in Spain. National Socialism did not try to come to grips with Bolshevism in Russia, but the Jewish international Bolsheviks in Moscow have tried to introduce their system into Germany and are still trying to do so. Against this attempt we have waged a bitter struggle, not only in defense of our own civilization, but in defense of European civilization as a whole.

In January and February of the year 1933, when the last decisive struggle against this barbarism was being fought out, had Germany been defeated and had the Bolshevik field of destruction and death extended over Central Europe, perhaps a different opinion would have arisen on the banks of the Thames as to the nature of this terrible menace to humanity. Since it is said that England must be defended

on the frontier of the Rhine, she would then have found herself in close contact with that harmless democratic world of Moscow, whose innocence they are always trying to impress upon us. Here I should like to state ~~once again~~ that Bolshevism teaches that there must be a world revolution, ~~which would mean world-destruction~~. If such a doctrine were accepted and given equal rights with other teachings in Europe, this would mean that Europe would be delivered up to it. If other nations wish to be on good terms with this peril, that does not affect Germany's position. As far as Germany itself is concerned, let there be no doubt on the following points: We look on Bolshevism as an intolerable world peril; we are using every means in our power to keep this peril away from our people; and we are trying to make the German people as far as possible immune to this peril. It is in accordance with this attitude of ours that we should avoid close contact with the carriers of these poisonous bacilli. And that is also the reason why we do not want to have any closer relations with them beyond the necessary political and commercial relations, for if we went beyond these we might thereby run the risk of closing the eyes of our people to the danger itself.

I consider Bolshevism the most malignant poison that can be given to a people. I do not want my own people, therefore, to come into contact with this teaching. As a citizen of this nation I myself shall not do what I should have to condemn my fellow citizens for doing. I demand from every German workman that he shall not have any relations with these international mischief-makers and he shall never see me clinking glasses or rubbing shoulders with them. Moreover, any further treaty connections with the present Bolshevik Russia would be completely worthless for us. It is out of the question ~~to think that National Socialist Germany should ever be bound to protect Bolshevism, or that we, on our side, should ever agree to accept the assistance of a Bolshevik State.~~ For I fear that the moment any nation should agree to accept such assistance, it would thereby seal its own doom. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1937)

International Germ-Carriers

As National Socialists we are clearly aware of the causes and conditions of this struggle [against Bolshevism] which is disturbing the world; but, above all, we recognize the extent and proportions of this conflict. It is a gigantic, historic occurrence, a tremendous danger which has confronted the culture and civilization of hu-

manity since the collapse of the classic world. This crisis cannot be compared with the general run of wars or recurrent revolutions. No, this is a universal mass-assault upon the contemporary social order, upon our spiritual and cultural existence. . . .

The duration of the struggle cannot be estimated. It is certain, however, that the world has not seen its like since the advent of Christianity, since the victorious surge of Mohammedanism, or since the Reformation. Just as in past eras these philosophic struggles influenced life in its entirety and drew it in the wake of their battles, Bolshevism reacts upon the world today. Its effect is that of a slow poison, which does not halt in the face of refusal. In past eras individual persons or peoples with other ideas and aims were unable to prevent themselves from being engulfed in catastrophes or decisive revolutions; today no one can save himself from the danger of Communism simply by disputing its existence or denying its dangerous effects.

I can well believe that the statesmen of the democratic world are not very happy to give their attention to the problems of Communism. But that is scarcely the point. They need not perhaps face this problem now, but some day they will have to, or their democracy, one way or another, will be ruined. This world plague does not ask permission to end democracy by a Marxist dictatorship; it will simply do so, unless it can be prevented. But this prevention cannot be brought about by a platonic rejection of these symptoms . . . ; it can only be achieved by immunizing peoples against this poison and by ~~attacking the international germ-carriers themselves~~. This immunization will be all the more necessary here in our closely interrelated Europe where the destinies of individual states are tightly bound up with each other. That is not all. This Europe is a community of peoples and states which have slowly developed side by side and have supplemented each other. Infection of one of the states of this community is not only a burden for the state in question and perhaps a matter of passing interest for the others, but, on the contrary, a problem of decisive importance for all of them. In school one does not permit healthy children to mix with those who are stricken by a contagious disease. In the long run the same situation prevails as regards Europe. Useful and prosperous cooperation between the nations of Europe is not possible as long as some of these nations which are afflicted with infectious poisons make no effort to conceal their attempt to infect others with the same plague. . . .

The very moment Bolshevism broke out in Spain, the nation's capacity to produce was so reduced that there appeared an immediate decline in a really valuable exchange of goods. If we are countered with the assertion that other countries are doing good business with Red Spain, we must point out that payment of these goods is being made in gold which has received its value not from Spanish Bolshevism, but from the labor and achievements of former National Spain, which in turn was pilfered by Spanish Bolshevism and sent abroad. One cannot build a solid and lasting economic policy upon such a foundation; that can only be based upon an exchange of real values and not in trade with stolen goods.

Bolshevism ruthlessly destroys the production of real values. Soviet Russia proves that even though subjecting its workers to a dog's life, Bolshevism cannot restore that production even after a period of twenty years. This may not interest wealthy Great Britain. It may be a matter of extreme indifference to the British if Spain becomes a desert, if she is economically ruined in the familiar Bolshevik manner. Perhaps England regards this Spanish situation only from the political point of view. But we Germans, who do not have the opportunity to anchor our economy in our own world empire, must regard contemporary Europe as one of the prerequisites of our existence. A Bolshevik Europe would render every commercial policy of this state impossible, not because we would not desire to trade, but because we could find no one with whom to trade. This is not merely a question of theoretical considerations, of moral solicitude, or a problem of international complaints—for we do not have enough respect for international institutions to believe for one second that they would be of any aid to us—but this is a problem of life or death for us. We know well, if Spain were to become completely Bolshevized and this Bolshevik wave were to spread over the rest of Europe—you know that Bolshevism regards this as a certainty and desires it—this would be a serious economic catastrophe for Germany. For we must continue a reciprocal exchange of goods with these countries in the obvious interest of maintaining the existence of the German people. Such an exchange is only possible, however, with such countries as manufacture commodities under normal and regulated conditions. Should a Bolshevik catastrophe make this possible, Germany would be faced with a serious economic dilemma.

I have only affirmed the facts in this case. We have, accordingly, a serious interest in preventing the further spread of this Bolshevik

plague over Europe. We have had, to be sure, many difficulties with national France in the course of history. Despite all that, somehow, we both belong to the European family of peoples, especially if we all search our inner souls. I believe none of us would want to miss or dispense with any of these real European cultural nations. We are mutually responsible not only for a great deal of hatred and suffering, but for much which has been mutually beneficial as well. We have exchanged our various contributions and we have given each other much of joy and beauty. If we are honest, we have every reason to admire each other much more than hate each other. In this community of European cultural nations Jewish world Bolshevism is an absolutely alien body which does not make the slightest contribution to our economic or cultural life. Instead, it only introduces confusion. . . .

Let me reiterate that no other type of orientation is possible for Germany. We are more interested in Europe than perhaps many other nations need to be. Our country, our people, our culture, our economy have grown out of general European conditions. We must, accordingly, be inimical towards every attempt to introduce elements of disintegration into this European family of peoples. To us Germans the thought that Europe should be directed or ruled from Moscow is simply unbearable. If such a presumption can be tolerated in other countries, we can but take notice of this with astonishment and regret. For us certainly, even the thought of taking orders from a world so far beneath us is as ridiculous as it is revolting. The pretension of an uncivilized Jewish Bolshevik international organization of criminals to rule over Germany from Moscow . . . is utterly impudent. Moscow remains Moscow and Soviet Russia remains Soviet Russia. Our German capital, however, is called Berlin and Germany remains, God be praised, still Germany. . . .

We National Socialists grew up in the struggle against this Bolshevik enemy. In the course of our fifteen years we have annihilated him spiritually, philosophically, and materially. Neither his countless murders and other acts of force, nor the support which he received from the Marxist leaders of the Reich at that time were able to impede our victorious progress. We will carefully keep watch today that such a danger will never come to Germany again. Should, however, anyone dare to bring this danger to our gates, or into the country, let him know that the National Socialist Reich has created weapons which will annihilate him with the speed of lightning. (Nuremberg, Sept. 13, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 14, 1937)

Communist Machinations

There is only one state with which we have not sought to establish good relations, nor do we wish to enter into close relations with Soviet Russia. More than ever do we see in Bolshevism the incarnation of the human destructive element.

But we do not make the Russian people as such responsible for this ghastly ideology of annihilation. We knew perfectly well that a small, powerful set of Jewish intellectuals plunged a nation into a state of things bordering on insanity. This would not concern us so much after all, had this doctrine remained within the frontiers of Russia herself, since Germany has no intention of foisting her conceptions of life on the Russian nation. Unfortunately, however, the Bolshevism of international Jewry attempts from its breeding-ground in Soviet Russia to rot away the very core of the nations of the world, to overthrow the existing social order, and to substitute chaos for civilization.

We certainly do not seek for contact with Bolshevism. On the contrary, it makes persistent efforts to corrupt the rest of mankind with its thoughts and ideas and by so doing to plunge the world into a disaster of unprecedented magnitude. In this respect we are ruthless foes. We overcame the Communist machinations of Moscow in our own land, and we have not the least intention of allowing Germany to be annihilated from without by the material forces of Bolshevism!

British statesmen have repeatedly assured us of their desire to maintain the *status quo* in the world. Since this is the case, let them apply it here. Whenever a European country falls a prey to Bolshevism, a shifting of positions becomes apparent. For the territories thus Bolshevized are no longer sovereign states with independent, national lives of their own, but are now mere sections of the Moscow Revolutionary Center. I am aware that Mr. Eden does not share this view. Mr. Stalin does, however, and is perfectly frank about it. In my opinion, Mr. Stalin is still at the moment of speaking a much better judge and interpreter of Bolshevik views and aims than a British Cabinet Minister! Therefore we look upon every attempt to spread Bolshevism, no matter where it may be, with utter loathing, and where it menaces us, we will oppose it. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

The Russo-German Pact of 1939

You know that Russia and Germany are governed by two different doctrines. There was only one question that necessitated clarification. Germany has no intention of exporting her doctrine, and from the moment that Soviet Russia had no thought of exporting her doctrine to Germany, I could see no more reason for us ever again to take a stand in oppositoin to each other. It is plain to both of us that others would be the only ones to profit by a conflict between our peoples. Therefore we determined to conclude a pact which excludes the use of force between us for all time to come. It furthermore obligates us to consult with each other on certain European questions which render economic collaboration possible. Above all it guarantees that the energies of these two great states will not be dissipated in strife with each other. Every attempt by the Western Powers to change anything here will be doomed to failure. Let me say here that this political decision signifies a turning point of tremendous consequences for the future. And it is final. I believe that the entire German people will welcome this political viewpoint. Germany and Russia fought opposite each other in the World War and both suffered greatly in the end. That will never happen again. The non-aggression and consultation pact which became effective on the day it was signed received its supreme ratification yesterday in Moscow and also in Berlin. This pact was greeted with exactly the same enthusiasm in Moscow as you are showing for it here. (Berlin, Sept. 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 2, 1939)

Sweetness and Light

At this point I want to make one thing quite clear. Russia remains what she is and Germany remains what she is. But both regimes have agreed on one point, namely, that neither the Russian nor the German regime is willing to sacrifice a single man in the interest of Western democracies. A lesson of four years of war is enough for both states and both peoples. They know only too well that first one and then the other might in turn have the doubtful honor of fighting for the ideals of the Western democracies. Both these states and both these peoples therefore refuse this offer with thanks. We intend in the future to look after our own interests, and we have discovered that we can best safeguard those interests if the two greatest peoples and states come to an understanding.

That is all the easier since the British assertion regarding the unlimited aims of German foreign policy is a lie. I am glad to be able to prove to British statesmen the falsity of this statement. Those British statesmen who continually declared that Germany intended to rule Europe as far as the Urals will now be delighted to learn the limits of Germany's political intentions. I believe, however, that it will deprive them of another pretext for war, since they declare that the very reason which forced them to fight against the present regime is because that regime was pursuing unlimited war aims.

Well, gentlemen of the great British Empire, Germany's aims are definitely limited. We have discussed the matter with Russia who is after all the neighbor whose interests are most involved. England should therefore actually welcome the fact that an agreement between Germany and Soviet Russia has been reached, for this agreement at the same time serves to dispel that nightmare about the alleged "world conquest aspirations" of the present German regime which robbed British statesmen of their sleep. They will be relieved to learn that it is not true that Germany either wants today or ever wanted to conquer the Ukraine. Our interests are very limited. Admittedly we are determined to safeguard those interests against any danger and against any aggressor. And the past eighteen days furnish ample proof that we are not prepared to stand for any nonsense. (Danzig, Sept. 19, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 20, 1939)

Mutual Cooperation

In my speech at Danzig I already declared that Russia was organized on principles which differ from those held in Germany. However, since it became clear that Mr. Stalin saw nothing in these Russo-Soviet principles which should prevent him from cultivating friendly relations with states of a different political creed, National Socialist Germany sees no reason why it should adopt another criterion. The Soviet Union is the Soviet Union; National Socialist Germany is National Socialist Germany. But one thing is certain. From the moment when the two states mutually agreed to respect each other's distinctive regime and principles, every reason for any mutually hostile attitude disappeared. Long periods in the history of both nations have shown that the inhabitants of these two largest states in Europe were never happier than when they lived in friendship with each other. The Great War, in which Germany and Russia fought against each other, was disastrous for both countries. It is easy to under-

stand that especially the capitalist states of the West are interested today in playing off these two states and their principles against one another whenever possible. For this purpose, they would certainly regard the Soviet Union as a sufficiently respectable partner for the conclusion of military pacts. But they regard it as perfidy when their honorable approaches are rejected and when, instead, a rapprochement takes place between those very Powers which have every reason for seeking the happiness of their respective peoples in developing their economic relationship along the lines of peaceful cooperation. A month ago I stated in the Reichstag that the conclusion of the German-Russian Non-Aggression Pact marked a turning point in the whole of Germany's foreign policy. The new pact of friendship and mutual interest signed since then between Germany and the Soviet Union will insure not only peace but constant, satisfactory cooperation for both states. Germany and Russia together will remove the threatening character of one of the most acute danger spots in Europe and will, each in her own sphere, contribute to the welfare of the people living there. This will thus aid European peace in general. If certain circles today see in this fact either the breakdown of Russia or that of Germany—whichever suits them best—I should like to answer them as follows.

For many years imaginary aims have been attributed to Germany's foreign policy, which at best might be taken to have originated in the mind of a schoolboy. At a moment when Germany is struggling to consolidate her living space, which consists only of a few hundred thousand square kilometers, shameless journalists in countries which rule over 40,000,000 square kilometers assert that Germany is aspiring to world domination! The German-Russian agreements should prove immensely comforting to those worried sponsors of universal liberty, for after all they show most emphatically that their assertions regarding Germany's aims for domination of the Urals, the Ukraine, Rumania, and the like are only the distorted products of their morbid Martian fantasies. In one respect, it is true, Germany's decision is irrevocable, namely, to see peaceful, stable, and thus tolerable conditions introduced also on her eastern frontiers. It is precisely here that Germany's interests and desires correspond entirely with those of the Soviet Union. The two states are resolved to prevent problematic conditions arising between them which contain the germs of internal unrest, and thus also of external disorder, and which might perhaps in any way unfavorably affect the relationship of these two

great states with one another. Germany and the Soviet Union have therefore clearly defined the boundaries of their own spheres of interest with the intention of being responsible for law and order in the corresponding area and of preventing everything which might cause injury to the other partner. (Berlin, Oct. 6, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 7, 1939)

Consanguinity

In the opinion of British politicians their last hopes (apart from Allied peoples consisting of a number of kings without a throne, statesmen without a nation, and generals without an army) seem to be based on fresh complications which they hope to bring about, thanks to their proven skill in such matters. A veritable "Wandering Jew" among these hopes is the belief in the possibility of a fresh estrangement between Germany and Russia. German-Russian relations have been finally established. The reason for this is that Britain and France, authorized by certain lesser powers, continually credited Germany with the desire to conquer territory which lay outside the sphere of German interest. It was said, at one time, that Germany wanted to possess the Ukraine; again, that she intended to invade Finland; yet again, that she had threatened Rumania; and, finally, fears were entertained for the safety of Turkey.

In these circumstances, I conceived it right to enter into straightforward discussions with Russia, in order to define clearly, once and for all, what Germany believes she must regard as her sphere of interests vital to her future, and which Russia, on the other hand, considered essential to her existence. This clear definition of their several spheres of interest was followed by a new basis for German-Russian relations. All hope that the completion of this might give rise to fresh tension between Germany and Russia is futile. Neither has Germany undertaken any steps which would have led her to exceed the limits of her sphere of interest, nor has Russia done anything of the kind. Britain's hope that she could, by bringing about a new European crisis, better her own position, amounts insofar as this concerns Germany's relation with Russia, to a false conclusion. British statesmen are always somewhat slow in grasping facts but they will learn to see this in time. (Berlin, July 19, 1940; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 21, 1940)

Consanguinity?

Never did the German people harbor hostile feeling against the peoples of Russia. However, for over ten years Jewish Bolshevik rulers had been endeavoring from Moscow to set not only Germany but all Europe aflame. At no time did Germany ever attempt to carry her National Socialist *Weltanschauung* into Russia, but on the contrary Jewish Bolshevik ruler in Moscow unswervingly endeavored to foist their domination upon us and other European peoples, not only by ideological means but above all with military force. . . .

Today something like 160 Russian divisions are standing at our frontiers. For weeks constant violations of this frontier have taken place, not only affecting us but from the far North down to Rumania. Russian airmen consider it sport nonchalantly to overlook these frontiers, presumably to prove to us that they already feel themselves masters of these territories. During the night of June 17th to June 18th Russian patrols again penetrated into Reich territory and could only be driven back after prolonged firing. This has brought us to the hour when it is necessary for us to take steps against this plot devised by the Jewish Anglo-Saxon war mongers and equally the Jewish rulers of the Bolshevik center in Moscow. (Berlin, June 22, 1941; *New York Times*, June 23, 1941)

That Bear Again!

In the morning of June 22nd, this greatest battle in world history began. Since then somewhat more than three and a half months have passed, and today I can make the following statement. Everything since then has proceeded according to plan. . . . We misjudged one thing, however. We had no conception of the gigantic preparations of this enemy against Germany and Europe, of how tremendously great this danger really was, and how very narrowly we escaped this time the annihilation not only of Germany but of all of Europe. Today I can reveal this. I say this for the first time today because now I can state that this enemy has been defeated and will never rise again. A power had gathered strength against Europe, of which most people were not aware at all and of which many are not aware even today. It would have become another Mongol invasion of a new Genghis Khan. That this danger was averted we owe first of all to the bravery, the perseverance and the spirit of sacrifice of our German soldiers, and also to the sacrifices of all those who marched along with

us. For the first time, something like a European awakening has occurred on this continent. . . .

Behind our troops there already lies by now a territory twice the size of the German Reich when I came to power in 1933, or four times the size of England. As the crow flies, the distance covered by the German soldiers is almost 800 to 1,000 kilometers. The actual number of kilometers which the soldiers have marched is often one and one half to twice this amount, that is, considering the gigantic length of the front. The German soldier opposes an enemy who, I must admit, does not consist of human beings but of animals, of beasts. We now have seen what Bolshevism can make of men. We cannot even hope to give the people back home an idea of what we have seen. It is the most horrible thing ever conjured up by a human brain—an enemy who fights on the one hand out of a sheer bestial thirst for blood, coupled with cowardice and fear of commissars on the other. That is the country our soldiers now have come to know after almost twenty-five years of Bolshevik rule. . . .

I always pictured this “paradise of the workers and peasants” correctly. At the conclusion of this campaign, 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 soldiers will bear me out that I was telling the truth. They will be the witnesses whom I can call upon. They marched in the streets of this paradise. They were not able to live in the miserable huts of that paradise, for they do not even enter them unless it is absolutely necessary. They have seen the interior of this paradise. It is nothing but one big arsenal at the expense of the standard of living of the people. An arsenal against Europe. And our soldiers won their victories against this cruel, bestial, inhuman enemy, against this powerfully armed enemy. (Berlin, Oct. 3, 1941; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Oct. 4, 1941)

Mongolians All the Time

The winter struggle of the Finns forced on us a feeling mixed with bitterness and admiration. Admiration because we have a heart sensitive to sacrifice and heroism, being a nation of soldiers ourselves; bitterness, because with our eyes fixed on the menacing enemy in the West, and on the danger in the East, we were not in a position to render military assistance. As soon as it became evident that Soviet Russia deduced the right to wipe out the nations living outside the limits of the German sphere of interest, . . . our subsequent relations were merely governed by utilitarian considerations, while our reason and feelings were hostile.

With every month I became more convinced that the plans of the men in the Kremlin aimed at the domination and the annihilation of all Europe. . . . At a time when the German nation had only a few divisions in the provinces bordering on Russia it would have been evident to a blind man that a concentration of power of singular and world historic dimensions was taking place, not in order to defend something which was threatened but merely in order to attack an object it did not seem possible to defend. The lightning conclusion of the Western campaign, however, robbed the Moscow overlords of their hope of an early flagging of German power. This did not alter their intentions—it merely led to a postponement of the date on which they intended to strike. In the summer of 1941 they thought the time was ripe. A new Mongolian storm was now to sweep Europe. At the same time, however, Mr. Churchill spoke on the English aspect of the struggle with Germany. He saw fit, in a cowardly manner, to deny that in the secret session of 1940 in the House of Commons he pointed out that the entry of Russia into the war, which was to come in 1941 at the very latest, was the most important factor which would make a successful conclusion of the war possible. This was also to enable England to take the offensive. In the spring of that year, Europe was to feel the full extent of the might of a world power which seemed to dispose of inexhaustible human material and resources. Dark clouds began to gather on the European sky. For, my deputies, what is Europe? There is no fitting geographical definition of our continent but only a national and cultural one. Not the Urals form the frontier of our continent, but the eternal line which divides the eastern and western conceptions of life. . . .

Just as the Greeks once faced the Persians in war, and the Romans faced the Carthaginians . . . and the Spanish heroes defended not only Spain but the whole of Europe against Africa, just so Germany is fighting today, not for herself, but for the entire continent. (Berlin, Dec. 11, 1941; B.B.C.)

Victims for Victory

The steppes of the East have once more sent the steamroller of their massed millions against Europe, driven by the same power which, from time immemorial, has organized intrigues by which they have profited and which even now are directing capitalist interests and Bolshevik instincts to the same purpose. How great was the danger this winter that the continent with the oldest culture in the world

might be overrun, may be left for historical research of a later day to record. The fact that this danger has now been overcome and Europe is thereby saved from it, is the everlasting achievement of those soldiers whose memory we honor today. A mere glance at the gigantic preparations which Bolshevism made for the destruction of our world makes us realize with horror what would have become of Germany, and of all the rest of the continent, if the National Socialist Movement had not been given power in the state ten years ago and if it had not immediately started building up the German armed forces again.

...

More and more clearly we recognize that the conflict in which Germany and Europe have been involved since the first World War is gradually assuming the character of a struggle which can be compared only with the greatest historic events of the past. Eternal Jewry forced upon us a pitiless and merciless war. If it had not been possible to bring to a halt the elements of destruction before the gates and frontiers of Europe, it would have transformed this continent into one vast area of ruins. It would not be only cities consumed by fire and monuments of culture destroyed which would remain as the worst consequences of this struggle, but the bestially butchered masses of people who would fall victim to this flood from the depths of Asia, as was the case once before—at the time of the onslaughts of the Huns and Mongols. . . .

I repeat my one-time prophecy that at the end of this war it will not be Germany and the states allied with her who will be the victims of Bolshevism, but rather those countries and peoples who, since they surrender themselves time and again into the power of Jewry, will one day suffer collapse and thereby meet their end at the hands of Bolshevism, against which they themselves are the least immune, if only because of their obsolete social order. (Berlin, March 21, 1943; F.C.C.)

16

Partners for Conquest

For us National Socialists . . . the attempted rapprochement with Italy is not a matter of sentiment, but the result of very selfish considerations.

Munich, Feb. 21, 1929

The Duce and I are neither Jews nor opportunists. When we two shake hands, it is with the firm grasp of men of honor.

Berlin, Jan. 30, 1941

Expediency dictated Hitler's alliances with Italy and Japan. These alliances had one basic objective—war and German expansion.

Hitler chose Italy as an ally because his aspirations and those of Mussolini were not antagonistic and because Italy could be played off against France. Much of the initiative came from Hitler, but world events also helped to bring the two dictatorships ever closer. While both countries emerged from World War I with grievances, the decisive, unifying factor was the Ethiopian crisis, as was admitted by Mussolini in September, 1937. Important, too, were their mutual aid to Franco, their opposition to Marxism, their departure from Geneva, and their avidity for conquest.

Considerations of Realpolitik also determined the Nazi accord with Japan and the final establishment of the Axis Tripartite in September, 1940. Notwithstanding the fact that an agreement with Nippon made a mockery of National Socialist racial principles, the Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936 was elaborately justified as a bulwark against the Red peril.

Although Germany, Italy and Japan continued their aggressive policies in Europe and Asia, the Fuehrer piously proclaimed that their objective was world peace. Germany and Italy were solemnly represented as bi-partite custodians of European security and culture. Japan's rape of China was heralded as a constructive gesture for the consolidation of Eastern Asia.

The real aim of Hitler's alliance system was to intimidate the rest of the world into submission. He combined arrogant pride with military superiority in an attempt to keep America in her place and fearful of resisting the Axis. In accordance with his plan, Japan was to attack us in the Pacific while he conquered Europe and defeated England. The Tripartite Pact of September, 1940, and Hitler's speech of December 11, 1941, contain ample evidence of the Fuehrer's underlying purpose.

Closer Relations With Italy

There are only two states with which we could establish closer contact today, England and Italy. . . . England was once our enemy. She has accomplished her purpose in doing away with Germany's hegemony and destroying our fleet. She does not want to dissolve Germany. But we do not look calculatingly towards England, but towards France, with which country we can never come to terms. The Italy of today, of whose "imperialistic delusion" one always reads in our newspapers—we Germans should have reason to approach Italy if just on that ground alone—for an Italy with an "imperialistic" nationalistic consciousness is the natural opponent of France! Italy today has a population of 42,000,000, is poorer and more circumscribed than Germany and increases her population noticeably. In Italy too the question of emigration is a vital one—the question of the necessity for finding a region for surplus population. America closes her doors more and more. Therefore, Mussolini must of necessity engage in "Roman politics," that is, become a Mediterranean power. Italy needs room for her people. She must, therefore, turn on France. France is the opposite pole in respect to Italy; the fact that nations are related has as little significance in international life as in private life. Wars between kindred nations are frequently more embittered than any others.

Italy has already regulated her present relations with England. With her extended coast she could never fight against the sea power of England. Between the two there is being formed today a dual covenant based not on extravagant enthusiasm, but on practical expedience. France slowly approaches isolation. German policy has taken account of this and has made overtures to France. We have always had the luck to be allied with weak and powerless nations whose death was already written on their foreheads. There can be no doubt that in the coming inevitable conflict in Europe one cannot stand on the side lines. . . .

The international and "national" circles have raised a new cry. This hue and cry of the last few years against Italy has to do with the South Tyrol. But who betrayed the South Tyrol? The same people who signed at Saint Germain! Who has the effrontery to sacrifice 300,000 on the battlefield for 170,000 Germans? Will the parliamentarians perhaps march in the vanguard to this battle? The policy of making a hue and cry without having power is like the barking of a

dog on the leash! . . . Will perhaps the editorial staff of the *Muenchener Neuesten Nachrichten* march with Herr Gerlich at the fore?

When France expels hundreds of thousands, when Poland massacres Germans, the greatest political bargainer (*Kuhhaut*) of the land does not have a word to say, but when Italy expels three Germans, he becomes rebellious and uncorks editorials by the yard! All this is nothing but hypocrisy! Our Movement can point to martyrs enough who went to prison and died for their Germany. Think of Dietrich Eckart! The political bargainer does not have a word to say about that, but because a few men are expelled from Italy, there is great indignation! And the reason? Because in Italy a man rules who fights world-wide Free Masonry! As nationalists we sympathize deeply with the misfortune of our separated brothers. If we want to keep our freedom, however, we must pursue a national policy; we must renounce parts in order to save the whole!

Today France could be isolated, if people in Germany desired it. But now, just as in the year 1918, the newspapers fight for high finance and against everything that will not join with it. Our nation might be called fortunate, if we were like Italy, if we had a statesman [Mussolini] such as Italy, which has terminated civil war and does not see only clouds with silver lining on the horizon. (Munich, March 30, 1927; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 1, 1927)

Future Ally

A possible ally is Italy. Such a consideration provokes the opposition of the whole bourgeois world. But it is precisely the contradiction of Free Masonry and the Jews which proves to us the correctness of our view. I am accused of raving about Mussolini. Well, I have not yet become acquainted with the great statesman (great in contrast to Gustav Stresemann) and I envy Italy because of him and regret that we do not have him [in Germany]. The interests of Italy and Germany do not conflict. It is ridiculous to ask whether the Italians have a pro-German tendency. They are just as one hundred per cent Italian as I am one hundred per cent German. Our common interests are to be sought in an antagonism to France, that is, in a mutual antagonism. Italy must expand in the Mediterranean and she thus automatically comes into opposition with France. Italy needs Africa in order to settle her surplus population there. France needs Africa for exploitation. Is Italy then imperialistic? Yes, thank God, for she is therewith the opponent of France. And the day will certainly come

when the two nations will confront each other as deadly enemies. Both are arming. A pistol shot could bring the struggle to an issue. France is also our opponent. We must grasp the hand, therefore, of an ally whom we know is the opponent of France. The two Powers will struggle in the Mediterranean for hegemony. I hope that Italy wins and France loses, for if France wins, she will immediately turn on us. Italy, on the other hand, would have to colonize and she would then be occupied with this. The ideas behind concluding an alliance (*Bundesgedanke*) must not be built up on sympathies, but on practical grounds.

It is said that the question of the South Tyrol is a factor against an alliance with Italy. Well, Alsace-Lorraine, the Saar and the Rhineland speak against an alliance with France, the colonies against an alliance with England, Silesia and West Prussia against an alliance with Poland, Bohemia against an alliance with Czechoslovakia, the Banat against an alliance with Yugoslavia, Siebenbuergen against an alliance with Rumania. With whom then should one ally oneself? With the oppressed peoples in India or Upper Egypt? Do you liberate the South Tyrol by not making an alliance with Italy? Who was it then that betrayed the South Tyrol? It was those who betrayed everything, who sabotaged the war, made peace resolutions, caused munition strikes and revolution and finally gave up a legal claim to the region. At that time no one made a protest. Today they do not have the South Tyrol, but they do not want to give up their claims to it. Then, you screamers, you should say, "We want to conquer it again but we are too cowardly for that."

Is the Tyrol alone holy ground? Alsace, Silesia, Bohemia are all just as holy. No one concerns himself when Negroes are let loose on white women. Terrorism anywhere else does not bother anyone, only the South Tyrol is noticed. The South Tyrol is oppressed; in Germany there is even more oppression. In the South Tyrol there is persecution; in Germany there is even worse persecution. In the first five months of this year the "German Terror" caused nine deaths and 670 casualties. German culture is being poisoned; indeed, who poisons it most? In Berlin more Germans are spiritually destroyed than the South Tyrol has inhabitants and more women and girls are ruined than there are in the South Tyrol. No one, however, sees that. The people of the South Tyrol are filled with false hopes and left in the lurch, as was also done with the young nationalists in Germany.

We fight against hypocrisy with our eyes open. The idea today is

not to liberate the South Tyrol but to give life to Germany. All this hue and cry has not helped the South Tyrol; let us consider it rather as a bridge between Germany and Italy. That will help the Tyrolese more. (Berlin, July 15, 1928; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, July 18, 1928)

On the Basis of Realpolitik

It was a happy day for me when I heard that Mussolini wanted to renew the old Imperium, for this would compel Italy to march against France some day. It was Mussolini's idea of restoring the Imperium that brought about peace with the Vatican. I represent the view that everyone should achieve salvation according to his own religion. I am happy that the Italians have restored domestic peace with their church because this strengthening of internal forces is necessary for the conflict with France.

I should not like to be counted sometime among those statesmen who are pleased if they manage to bring about twelve declarations of war. I should rather carry on one fight with superior power. If Bismarck forced more than 7,000,000 Germans out of the German Confederation because that was the requisite for the recovery of the Reich, then I believe we will be able to justify ourselves before history if we do not conquer everything with our mouths that the others lost through their deeds.

The protests against this policy of ours date from the time when Mussolini and therewith Fascism came to power in Italy. It is no accident that our policy was not attacked until after the year 1922. The struggle against us did not come until a government was in power in Italy which did not suit our opponents. The Marxists incited against Tsarism; today they incite against Fascism. I emphasize the fact that party politics have never yet determined my actions in foreign policy. The only thing that influences me is national considerations. Our opponents say that Italy is not the ally for us because Italy betrayed us in the World War. I most solemnly assert that if Germany had been a National Socialist State at that time I would have let Austria fall. I would never have led millions to battle in order to save a political cadaver. Our attitude towards Italy has nothing to do with a particular government, or even with Mussolini. Our position is not based on fantasies but on the basis of *Realpolitik* and economic facts. It is said that one cannot leave the 230,000 people of the South Tyrol to their fate. I assert that these persons were deserted just like the other 16,000,000 by the peace treaties. If someone gives something

up, he must first have it. One might as well complain that Stresemann betrayed Alsace-Lorraine. One cannot take the view that any folkic group is worth more than another group. If 30,000,000 Germans who do not belong to the Fatherland are to be won back, it can be accomplished only by means of power-politics. We do not want war for its own sake but we protest against the renunciation of reconquest. One must at least have the courage to advocate those reconquests which are of vital necessity. It is necessary that we reconquer territories in the East and West, but I do not advocate a conquest of the South Tyrol, because of sober considerations of *Realpolitik*. I am not in favor of shedding blood on account of the South Tyrol because I know what great sacrifices such a struggle entails. I know war as a grenadier, as one who has gone through everything that can shatter a person's nerves. But my nerves were not shattered. Whoever leads his people into such a blood bath without achieving a reward commensurate with the sacrifices involved commits a crime. We National Socialists would never allow ourselves to lead our people into a war frivolously!

The problem of the South Tyrol is complicated because it is a region in which two peoples are mixed together. Today the eventuality of a decision by force of arms is imminent. Any change there by means of war on the part of Germany is out of the question. In 1919 and 1920 I always declared it was the task of a conscientious foreign policy not to awaken any false hopes among borderland Germans, but to educate them to be prudent so that this prudence could be of aid to them. Rights cannot be won back by protests and articles in the newspapers, but by the power of the motherland! Everything that is calculated to strengthen the motherland is correct; everything else is wrong. The problem is not the South Tyrol; the problem is Germany with her 62,000,000 inhabitants. . . .

I am accused of admiring Mussolini. At a time when only dwarfs are in evidence, I welcome the sight of any man! And that is not only my view but also the view of the *Bayerischer Kurier*, which on January 13, 1928, wrote that even the opposition must admit that Mussolini is the greatest, perhaps the only real, statesman in the world today. This statesman is the only possibly ally for Germany because he values national honor and domestic order. I could not be a man with blood in my veins if I did not admit that I have admiration for such a person. I have more than admiration. I am sorry and envious that Germany lacks such a man! (Munich, May 8, 1929; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 9/10, 1929)

*An Association of Action**

Men and women! At this moment we are the witnesses of a historic event which has never before taken place in this form and to this extent. More than a million people have assembled here to attend a demonstration in which 115,000,000 members of two nations participate with intense feeling, and which hundreds of millions of people in the rest of the world are following as more or less interested listeners. That which moves us all the more in this hour is the great joy of knowing that there is in our midst as a guest one of those solitary men of history whom history does not put to trial, but who themselves make history. We feel that this demonstration is not one of those meetings such as always take place elsewhere, but that it expresses an avowal of common ideals and common interests. It is an avowal that is expressed by two men, that is heard by a million people here, but which 115,000,000 await and affirm with burning hearts.

That is why this evening we are having not a mere assembly of the people, but a demonstration of nations. The deepest meaning of this demonstration of nations, however, is the sincere wish to guarantee our countries that peace which is not the reward of submissive cowardice, but the result of securing, through a sense of responsibility our racial, spiritual and physical as well as our cultural possessions and values. We believe thereby that we can also best serve those interests which, reaching beyond our two nations, should be in reality the interests of the whole of Europe.

If today we are in a position to hold this demonstration here, let us measure the change of the times which lie behind us. No people can long more for peace than the German people; but no people has learned to know the terrible consequences of blind confidence in others than our people. Behind us there lies a period of fifteen years . . . which was one long series of oppressions, extortions, the denial of equal rights and therewith of unutterable and material distress. The ideals of liberalism and democracy in our country did not save the German nation from the most terrible violations which are historically imaginable. Thus National Socialism had to establish a different and more effective ideal in order to restore to our people those universal human rights that had been refused it for a decade and a half.

During this time of the most bitter tribulations, Italy and especially Fascist Italy—this I must proclaim tonight before the German peo-

*This speech was given in the Olympic Stadium in Berlin during Mussolini's visit to Germany in Sept., 1937.

ple and the entire world—did not participate in the humiliation inflicted upon our people. Italy in these years was able to show understanding for the demands of a great nation for equal rights, for its existence and not the least of all for its national honor. Thus we are filled with sincere satisfaction that an hour has come when we could remember this—and as I believe—have remembered it.

Out of the mutuality of the Fascist and the National Socialist Revolutions there has arisen today an association not only of views but of action. This is a stroke of good fortune in an age and for the world when the tendencies of destruction and deformation are visible everywhere. Fascist Italy has become a new empire through the able and creative activity of a man of organizing genius. You, Benito Mussolini, with your own eyes will have been able to establish this fact in connection with our National Socialist State; Germany, too, in her national attitude and in her military strength has again become a world power. The might of these two Empires forms today the strongest guarantee for the preservation of a Europe which possesses a feeling for its cultural mission, and is not willing to fall into decay because of the destructive elements of dissolution. All of you who are gathered here in this hour, or who are listening in throughout the rest of the world, must admit that here are two independent national regimes which have found the way to one another, and which stand together at the same time when the ideals of our democratic Marxist International are able everywhere to exhibit only demonstrations of hate and schism. Every attempt to separate or to dissolve such a community of peoples by playing them off one against the other through suspicions or through the attributions of false aims will fail. It will fail because of the desire of the 115,000,000 who in this hour form this demonstration, and especially because of the will of the two men who stand here before you and speak to you. (Berlin, Sept. 28, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 29, 1937)

*Long Live Fascist Italy**

Your Excellency! As *Fuehrer* and Chancellor of the German people I have the great joy and honor to extend to you today in the capital of the Reich a most hearty welcome. The German nation welcomes you with me in this festive hour, as the highly gifted creator of Fascist Italy, as the founder of a new empire.

*Hitler's toast to Mussolini at the banquet in the Chancery given in honor of the Duce.

On your trip through Germany your Excellency will have appreciated from the great enthusiasm with which you were greeted by all classes of the German people that your visit means more to us than a mere diplomatic event and purely conventional meeting. At a time when the world is full of tensions and alarming confusions in which the most dangerous elements attempt to attack and destroy the old culture of Europe, Italy and Germany have found themselves in sincere friendship and common political cooperation.

This cooperation is being carried out not only because of the same indestructible will to live and to assert themselves on the part of the Italian and the German people, but beyond that because of the closely related political ideals which, we are convinced, are a foundation for the internal strength and solidity of our states. Whereas these mutually basic political principles constitute a strong tie which binds our two peoples, there also operates in the same direction the fact that in the material and vital interests of Italy and Germany there are no elements of severance, but only elements of a complimentary and unifying nature.

The conversations which have taken place between your Excellency and myself in the last few days have again confirmed this fact. We believe, therefore, that our political activity can be considered as a safeguard to peace and to the flowering of European culture, not as the creation of a *bloc* directed against other European states. On the contrary, we are convinced that through our mutual work we best serve not only the interests of our two countries but in addition the objective of general international understanding which lies close to our hearts.

In this spirit Italy and Germany will examine and deal with political problems side by side, in order to oppose every attempt to separate the two nations or even to play one off against the other. I raise my glass and drink to the health of the King of Italy, Emperor of Ethiopia, your exalted Sovereign, as well as to the personal well-being of your Excellency and to the greatness and prosperity of the Fascist Italian nation. (Berlin, Sept. 29, 1937; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Sept. 30, 1937)

Japan—Guarantor for Humanity and Culture

I cannot agree with those politicians who think they do Europe a service in harming Japan. I am afraid the defeat of Japan in eastern Asia would never benefit Europe or America but only Bolshevi-

Soviet Russia. I do not consider China strong enough, either spiritually or materially, to withstand on her own any attack by Bolshevism. I believe, however, that even the greatest victory gained by Japan would be infinitely less dangerous to world peace than any success achieved by Bolshevism. Germany has concluded a pact with Japan to counteract Comintern aims.* She has always been on friendly terms with China, so I think under the circumstances we may best be considered truly neutral spectators of this drama. I need hardly say we all earnestly desire, and still desire, appeasement between these two great Eastern nations, and the ultimate restoration of amicable relations. We are certain, however, that peace would have been restored long ere now if certain elements had not, as in the case of Abyssinia, upset the balance in Eastern Asia by putting their advice and perhaps promises of moral assistance into the scale of one party. This attitude—as matters stand—could only have a platonic significance. A drowning man, however, clutches at every straw. It would have been more expedient to have drawn China's attention to the full gravity of her position, instead of citing, as so often before, the League of Nations as the safe guarantee of peace and security!

No matter at what time and in what manner the happenings in Eastern Asia may ultimately right themselves, Germany, in the defensive attitude she adopts toward Communism, will always regard and appreciate Japan as an element of security, and a guarantee, moreover, for the culture of mankind. For just as we are perfectly certain that Japan's greatest victory would not affect the civilization of the white races in the very least, so do we not doubt for a moment that a victory gained by Bolshevism would signify the end of the present thousand-year-old civilization of the white races!

In this connection I should like to defend myself most emphatically against idiotic attacks which accuse Germany of betraying the interests of the white race in the conflict in the Far East, because of the attitudes we have adopted. Really, I must confess we are simply amazed when forced to read such assertions in French and English newspapers. That this National Socialist State, always the object of attack on account of its racial policy, should now suddenly have the honor of drawing the sword for racial ideals, or, rather let us say racial interests, is a huge jest in world history. Germany has no territorial interests in Eastern Asia. She has the natural wish to carry on trade and commerce, and in so doing she is not obliged to support any

*The Anti-Comintern agreement was signed between Germany and Japan in Berlin on November 25, 1936.

one party. But we are obliged to recognize the fact that a Bolshevik victory would destroy the last possibilities in this sphere of activity. Moreover, Germany herself once possessed territory in Eastern Asia. True, this did not prevent certain powers with the help of a coalition of white and yellow races from expelling the German Reich from that country. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

Bulwark of Security

Italian-German relations are based on conceptions of life and state policy common to both nations, as well as on cooperative action in warding off the international dangers that menace us both. How greatly this fact is appreciated everywhere in Germany was most strikingly evidenced in the joyous enthusiasm with which the creator of the Fascist State was welcomed in the Reich.* One fact at least ought to be acknowledged by all European statesmen. If Mussolini had not conquered Italy in 1922 with the help of his Fascist Movement, the country would in all probability have fallen a prey to Bolshevism. The dire consequences to Western culture in the event of such a collapse would be inconceivable. The very thought of such a possibility is horrifying to a man of historical vision and a sense of responsibility based upon a knowledge of facts. Benito Mussolini enjoys the admiration of the German people to a phenomenal extent.

Italy's position resembles that of Germany in certain respects. Under the circumstances, therefore, it was but natural that suffering as we both do from overcrowding, we should evince keen understanding for the activities of a man and his government who, refusing to allow their people to be sacrificed on the altar of the fantastic ideals of the League of Nations, were fully determined to save their nation. And all the more so since there is no doubt that the apparent ideals of the League of Nations coincide rather too closely with the exceedingly realistic interests of its chief powers.

Furthermore, Germany and Italy have taken a common stand with regard to the Spanish conflict. Its aim is to see a national Spain which enjoys complete independence. The Italian-German friendship, springing as it does from definite sources, has become an element of stabilization in the appeasement of Europe. The connection of both states with Japan presents the most powerful of all obstructions to the further advance of the menacing power of Russian Bolshevism. (Berlin, Feb. 20, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Feb. 21, 1938)

*This reference is to Mussolini's visit to Germany in Sept., 1937.

Thanks to Benito

I felt obliged to explain [the *Anschluss* with Austria] in a letter to the leader of that great Fascist country, who is such a personal friend of mine, the reasons for my action and especially to assure him that after this event nothing will change the attitude of Germany toward Italy and that Germany regards—just as in the case of France, so also in the case of Italy—the existing frontiers as permanent. I should like to express to the great Italian statesman in the name of the German people and in my own name our warmest thanks. We know what Mussolini's attitude has meant for Germany in these days. If there could have been a strengthening of the relations between Italy and Germany it has taken place. A community of ideology and interest has become for us Germans an indissoluble friendship. The land and frontiers of this friend are to us inviolable. I repeat I shall never forget Mussolini's attitude. The Italian people know that the German nation supports my word. Thus on this occasion, as before, the Axis that connects our two countries proves to be of the greatest service to the peace of the world. (Berlin, March 18, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, March 19, 1938)

*Friendship—To the End**

Duce! With deep emotion I thank you for the heartfelt words of greeting which you addressed to me in the name of the Italian Government and the Italian people. I am happy to be in Rome, in which the powerful manifestations of young Fascist Italy combine with the testimonies of the city's incomparably glorious past. From the moment that I set foot on Italian soil I have found everywhere an atmosphere of friendship and sympathy which makes me profoundly happy. With the same deep emotion, the German people last autumn greeted in your person the creator of Fascist Italy, the founder of a new Empire, and at same time the great friend of Germany.

The National Socialist Movement and the Fascist Revolution have created two new and powerful states which today, in a world of unrest and disintegration, stand as structures of order and healthy progress. Thus Germany and Italy have similar interests and are closely bound to one another by their common ideology. In this way there

*Hitler's reply to Mussolini at the banquet held in the Palazzo Venezia during the Fuehrer's visit to Italy.

has been created in Europe a *bloc* of 120,000,000 people who are determined to safeguard their eternal and vital rights and to defend themselves against all forces which may oppose their natural development.

Out of this struggle against a world of misunderstanding and opposition which Germany and Italy have had to wage shoulder to shoulder, a cordial friendship has gradually grown up between the two peoples. This friendship has proved its firmness during the events of the last few years. At the same time this friendship has shown the world that it is necessary to take some account in one way or another of the legitimate and vital interests of great nations. It is therefore only natural that our two nations should also in the future cultivate and deepen by constant collaboration this friendship which in these last few years has become ever more solid.

Duce! Last autumn on the Maifeld in Berlin you proclaimed as an ethical principle, sacred to you and Fascist Italy, the following: "Speak plainly and frankly and when you have a friend march with him right up to the end." In the name of National Socialist Germany, I too acknowledge this principle. Today I shall answer you: Since the Romans and the Germans, as far as we know from history, met for the first time, 2,000 years have now passed. As I stand on this soil, the most venerable soil in the history of mankind, I feel the tragedy of a fate which established no clear frontier between these two so highly gifted and so worthy races. Unspeakable suffering which lasted for generations was the consequence.

Today, after almost 2,000 years, thanks to your historic efforts, Benito Mussolini, the Roman State arises from its ancient traditions to new life. To the North of you a new German Empire has grown up from numerous tribes. Taught by the experience of 2,000 years, we two, now that we have become immediate neighbors, both acknowledge those natural frontiers which Providence and the history of our two nations have visibly drawn. These frontiers will enable Italy and Germany, by the clear division of their respective spheres of activity, not only to realize the good fortune of peaceful, secure and permanent collaboration, but they will also serve as a bridge for mutual help and support. It is my irrevocable will and my testament to the German people that the frontier of the Alps which nature has erected between us shall be regarded forever as inviolable. I know then that a great and prosperous future will ensue for Rome and Germany.

Duce! Just as you and your people have remained true to your friendship in days of great decisions, so I and my people will show

Italy the same friendship in times of stress. The magnificent impressions which I have already received of the youthful strength, the will to work, and the proud spirit of the new Italy will remain indelible in my memory. Unforgettable, too, was the sight of your soldiers and Blackshirts, fresh with recent glory; of your well-tested Navy and the prowess of your imposing Air Force. They give to me the assurance that your admirable work of construction, which I follow with the most sincere good wishes, will also lead to great results in the future.

I raise my glass and drink to your health, to the good fortune and greatness of the Italian people, and to our immutable friendship. (Rome, May 7, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 8, 1938)

Glorious Japanese Heroism

Our relationship with Japan is conditioned by the recognition and the determination that we must with supreme resolution put a stop to the threatened Bolshevisation of a world gone mad. The Anti-Comintern Pact will perhaps one day become the crystallization point of a group of powers whose ultimate aim is none other than to eliminate the menace to the peace and culture of the world instigated by such a satanic phenomenon. The Japanese people, which in the last two years has set us so many examples of glorious heroism, is without doubt fighting in the service of civilization at the other end of the world. Her collapse would not benefit the civilized nations of Europe or of other parts of the world, but would only lead to the certain triumph of Bolshevism in the Far East. Apart from international Jewry, which has its own interests there, no people in the world can wish to see such a development take place. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Onward Fascist Soldiers

In the Western world of today, they [the Italians] as the descendants of the ancient Romans and we Germans as the descendants of the Germanic peoples are the oldest peoples. Our relations with each other reach much farther back than do those of any other nations. In my speech in the Palazzo Venezia on the occasion of my visit to Italy I pointed out that it was indeed a calamity that the mightiest civilized nation of the ancient world and the young nation of a new world in the process of formation should, owing to the absence of a natural dividing line and under the influence of many other circumstances,

become involved in centuries of fruitless conflict. Out of the relationships of a thousand years there grew a bond which had its roots not only in countless racial ties, but above all in ties of immeasurable historical and cultural significance. The debt which the Germanic people owe to the ancient world in respect to the organization of the state and folkic development, as well as in the sphere of civilization in general, cannot be estimated in detail. It is in its sum total immense. Since then nearly two thousand years have passed. And now we too have made our own abundant contribution to civilization. We will always maintain close spiritual ties with the Italian people, and with its cultural and historical past. In the nineteenth century there was a strikingly similar process of unification. The German peoples became united in the German Reich, and the Italian states were united in the Kingdom of Italy. In the same year—1866—fate enabled both nations to take up arms simultaneously for the new form their state was to assume.

Today we are experiencing this parallel development for the second time. A man of outstanding importance was the first to bring forth a new idea in opposition to the democratic notions which had become barren in this people, and to carry this idea to victory within a few years. It is hard to estimate the significance of Fascism for Italy. What Fascism has done for the preservation of civilization is as yet incalculable. Who can stroll through Rome or Florence without being moved at the thought of the fate that all these unique documents of human art and civilization would have suffered if Mussolini and his Fascist Movement had not succeeded in saving Italy from Bolshevism. Germany was faced with this same danger. Here National Socialism has effected a miraculous rescue. In the imagination of countless individuals of every race, the belief in a new renaissance in our day is linked with these two states. The solidarity of these two regimes is therefore more than a matter of egoistic expediency. On this solidarity is founded the salvation of Europe from its threatened destruction by Bolshevism. For this reason Germany stood as a friend at the side of Italy when she fought her heroic struggle for her vital rights in Abyssinia. In 1938 Fascist Italy repaid us abundantly for this friendship. Let no one in the world make any mistake as to the resolve which National Socialist Germany has made as far as this friend is concerned. It can only serve the cause of peace if it is quite clearly understood that a war waged against the Italy of today will, once it is launched and regardless of its motives, call Germany to the side of her friend. Above all, let no one be ill-advised by

those isolated bourgeois weaklings who vegetate in every country, and who cannot understand that in the life of nations it is not necessarily cowardice, but also courage and honor that may prompt wisdom. As regards National Socialist Germany, she is well aware of the fate that awaits her if ever an international power, whatever its motive, should succeed in overcoming Fascist Italy.

We realize the consequences which would follow upon such an event and face them unflinchingly. The fate of Prussia in 1805 and 1806 will not be repeated a second time in German history. The weaklings who were the advisers of the King of Prussia in 1805 will give no advice in the Germany of today. The National Socialist State realizes the danger and is determined to take all steps to counteract it. I know too that not only our own defense forces, but also Italy's military power, are equal to the severest military requirements. Just as it is impossible to judge the present German Army by the standards of the old Army of the German Confederation of, say, 1848, so is it likewise impossible for any evaluation of modern Fascist Italy to be made by the standards of the days when the Italian State was not yet united. Only an hysterical, unteachable, tactless and extremely malicious press can forget in so short a time that only a few years it thoroughly disgraced itself with its prophecies concerning the outcome of the Italian campaign in Abyssinia, and it is not one whit better now in its judgment of Franco's national forces in the Spanish campaign. Men make history. But they also forge the instruments which are suited to the forming of history, and above all, they give them spirit. Great men, however, are themselves merely the strongest, most concentrated expression of a nation. National Socialist Germany and Fascist Italy are strong enough to safeguard peace against everyone, and to end resolutely and successfully any conflict which irresponsible elements lightly start. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Indestructible Axis

When in other countries it is said that they will arm and continue still greater armament, then I can say just one thing to these statesmen: You will not tire me out. I am determined to proceed further along this road, and I am convinced that we will proceed faster than the others. No power on earth will be able to entice our arms from us by any type of slogan. Should anyone, however, wish to measure his strength against ours by force, then the German people are also

in a position for this at any time, and they are also ready and determined. And just as we think, so think our friends. Especially so thinks the state with which we are most closely bound, and with which we march now and under all circumstances for all time to come. When hostile journalists do not know of anything else to write about, then they write about cracks and breaks in the Axis. They should calm themselves.

This Axis is the most natural political instrument that exists in this world. It is a political combination which owes its origin not only to reason and the desire for justice, but also to the strength of idealism. This structure will be more durable than the present ties of non-homogeneous bodies on the other side. For if anyone tells me today that there are no differences of any kind between the philosophical and ideological outlooks of England and Soviet Russia, then I can only say, I congratulate you, gentlemen.

I believe the time is not far distant in which the unity of world outlook between Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany will prove to be essentially different from the unity between democratic Britain and the Bolshevik Russia of Stalin. Should there in this case be no ideological difference between them, then I can only say: How correct, indeed, is my attitude toward Marxism, Communism and democracy. Why two phenomena if they are made up of the same substance? (Wilhelmshaven, April 1, 1939, *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 3, 1939)

Blessed Be the Ties That Bind

This year again Fascist Italy has shown the fullest understanding for Germany's just interests. No one should be surprised if we, for our part, have the same feelings for Italy's needs. The bond which unites the two peoples cannot be severed. Any attempt to cast suspicion on this fact appears ridiculous to us. In any case, this is best confirmed by an article that appeared a few days ago in a leading democratic newspaper, which stated that it should no longer be considered possible to separate Italy and Germany in order to destroy them separately.

Thus the German Government fully understands and appreciates the justice of the action taken by their Italian friend in Albania and, therefore, welcomes it. Indeed, it is not only the right, but also the duty of Fascism to secure for Italy, in the sphere unquestionably allotted to her by nature and history, that balanced order of things

which alone is the basis and security for a flourishing civilization. After all, there can be just as little room for doubt in the rest of the world concerning the civilizing work of Fascism as there is about that of National Socialism. In both instances, indisputable facts stand in contradiction to the unfounded braggadocio and unproved statements of the other side. The creation of still closer ties between Germany, Italy and Japan is the constant aim of the German Government. We regard the existence and maintenance of the freedom and independence of these three great Powers as the strongest factor for the future preservation of true human culture, practical civilization and a just world order. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

*Indissoluble Partnership**

Soldiers of Italy! Comrades!

I greet you in the city from which the National Socialist Revolution at one time emanated. I greet you in the house that has been erected as the center of leadership of this Revolution.

You are visiting the German Reich at a time when the National Socialist Revolution and the Fascist Revolution are mutually confronted with a world of jealousy and the hate of adversaries and enemies. I am happy that this visit comes at a time when through our alliance a common front is established against our mutual enemies. I am of the firm conviction that every attempt on the part of the democracies and the capitalistic plutocracies to prepare a fate for us, which they perhaps have premeditated, will miscarry because of the common strength of the two nations and the two Revolutions, because of the power of our mutual ideals, and because of our courage and our determination.

In the final analysis life belongs to the nations who are ready, if necessary, to die for their existence and their future. You yourselves once staked everything for your people and we Germans also did the same thing for our people. In the future we shall both together take this step for Germany and for Italy, for our Reich which was established by the National Socialist Revolution, and for your Empire, which was created and formed by your great Duce, Benito Mussolini, the man who in opposition to the views and prophecies of the

*Short address delivered to Italian World War veterans who visited Germany in June 1939.

entire world has made Italy great, strong and powerful. I believe that in this indissoluble partnership of the two nations and in their revolutionary ideas all attacks on the part of the outside world will fail, and that in spite of this the future will belong to Fascist Italy and to National Socialist Germany. (Munich, June 25, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, June 26, 1939)

Common Victory

I cannot conclude my survey of this struggle without at this time making mention of our ally. Ever since the commencement of the National Socialist regime two points were prominent in the program of its foreign policy: The achievement of a real understanding and friendship with Italy, and, second, the achievement of the same relationship with England. You are aware, gentlemen, that these ideals inspired me twenty years ago to the same extent as they did later. I have expressed and defended these ideals in print and in speeches on innumerable occasions, so long as I was only a member of the opposition in the democratic Republic.

As soon as the German people entrusted me with its leadership, I immediately attempted to realize in practical form this, the oldest of the ideals of National Socialist foreign policy. Even today I still regret that in spite of all my efforts I have not succeeded in achieving that friendship with England which, as I believe, would have been a blessing for both peoples. I was not successful, in spite of determined and honest efforts.

But I am all the more happy that the first point in the program of ideals in my foreign policy could be realized. Thanks for this are due, chiefly, to the genius who today stands at the head of the Italian people. It is entirely due to his success, the effects of which will endure for centuries to come, that it was possible to establish contact between the two Revolutions which spiritually are so nearly related and now, finally, to establish a new bond of blood which is destined to grant Europe new life. That I personally have the honor to be the friend of this man is a great joy to me in view of the unique nature of his destiny, which has just as much in common with mine as our two Revolutions and, moreover, as the history of the unification and rise of our two nations.

Since the rebirth of the German people, it has been only from Italy that any voice of human understanding has reached us. A lively community of interests arose from this reciprocal understanding. It

was finally sealed by a treaty. When, last year, this war was thrust **upon** Germany, against my wish and desire, the continued action of **our** two states was decided upon in discussion between Mussolini and **myself**. The advantages accruing to Germany from the attitude of **Italy** were exceptional. It is not only economically that the situation **and** attitude of Italy were of advantage to us, but also from a military point of view. From the very commencement of the war, Italy **held** strong units of our enemy occupied, and, above all, diminished **the** freedom of their strategic dispositions. When, however, the Duce considered that the right moment had come to take up arms **against** the continued and intolerable violations represented by French **and** British acts of interference and the King declared war, he did so **of** his own accord. Our feeling of gratitude, therefore, must be all the deeper.

Italy's entry into the war played a part in hastening France's recognition of the fact that further resistance would be completely unavailing. Since then our ally has fought, first, on the ridges and peaks of the Alps, and is now fighting in the wide regions which form her sphere of interest. The air attacks and the naval engagements now being carried out by our ally are being followed up in that spirit which is typical of the Fascist Revolution, and are being watched by us in that spirit which is inspired in National Socialism by Fascist Italy.

The anguish felt by Italy so recently at the death of Marshal Balbo is also Germany's anguish. Her every joy is also shared by us. Our cooperation in both the political and military spheres is complete. It will extinguish the injustice done to the German and Italian peoples in the course of centuries. For our efforts will be crowned by a common victory. (Berlin, July 19, 1940; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 21, 1940)

Till Death Do Us Part

How was it in the last century? Germany was fighting for her rebirth and unification as a state. So did Italy fight for her political unification. Then for the first time the two states marched together. Subsequently their ways parted, and neither found happiness. Then both states entered into a revolution, almost simultaneously. Their course is as similar as can be conceived . . . in the case of two different peoples. Both Revolutions took nearly the same course—many serious reverses, followed by ultimate victory. Both Revolutions had a

program of socialistic national rebirth. Both Revolutions unswervingly fulfilled their programs. Both aroused the hatred of the surrounding world. Both Revolutions represent nations unable to get their livelihood on their own soil, notwithstanding their industrious zeal. Both nations are confronted one day, without their intention, by the same foes, the same international position. It began as early as 1935 when England suddenly turned against Italy, without any provocation—Italy had not taken anything from England. . . . Exactly as in our case. . . . What have we taken from England? What do we want to take from her, from France, let alone America? Nothing, nothing at all. How often have I offered peace to them—what else should I have offered? There were men who simply declared what Churchill said, I wanted war. There was Churchill and his clique, and behind this corrupt and drunken individual international Jewry who paid the bill. On the other side there was an old Free Mason [Roosevelt] who saw in war the last hope of patching up his bankrupt economic system, or at least of gaining some time. Thus the two states [Germany and Italy] are facing again the same opponents, for the same reasons, and they are forced to fight together, to wage the same fight, and to be bound for life or death. . . .

In both cases it is men, two men who sprang from their people, who founded their Revolutions and led their states out of the depths. During the past weeks I have often used my scanty leisure time to read about the Fascist Revolution. It was as if I had the history of my own party before my eyes. So similar, so analagous, the same struggles against the same foes, the same opponents, the same arguments. Really it is a strange miracle. Now we fight in the same theaters of war—Germans in North Africa, Italians in the East. So we fight together and let no one be deceived about it, this struggle will be carried on until we have conquered together.

Now at last the third state has joined us; another state with which I always wanted to establish friendly relations. . . . It is Japan. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1942; B.B.C.)

Unrighteous England

I wanted the closest friendly relations with England.

Munich, Nov. 8, 1940

This twaddler, this drunkard, Churchill, what has he achieved in all his life? This mendacious specimen, this sluggard of the first order.

Berlin, Jan. 30, 1942

Hitler's original aim was to secure England's cooperation in the realization of his foreign policy. He started out by denouncing the colonial and naval policy of William II and by representing England as a prospective alliance partner. This technique was continued, after his rise to power, by numerous professions of friendship toward England. An important milestone was reached in 1935 when the British agreed that the new German navy (including submarines) should equal thirty-five per cent of their own.

Hitler's objective in the early thirties was to neutralize England, refortify the Rhineland, and rob France of her military supremacy in Europe. So long as Britain cooperated with him, all was serene, but once it became evident that the British would obstruct his path, the situation changed radically.

The change came after the Munich agreement. Hitler began an intensive campaign against what he called the English "war mongers." His purpose was to prepare a "war guilt" case against the British. His post-Munich speeches show him stimulating resentment against England by using the old device of singling out a "war party" in his opponent's ranks in order to hide his own machinations.

The Fuehrer's campaign took on new vigor after Chamberlain's assurances to Poland in March, 1939. Under the slogan of encirclement, which revived sullen memories of World War I, he aroused stronger resentment toward England. By mid-summer, "Einkreisung" had become a favorite topic in the German press. This was part of a plan by which the German people were psychologically conditioned for "England's war" if and when it occurred. Simultaneously, Hitler prepared for his pact with Stalin. Thus, when the Soviet accord came, Russia appeared to be a guarantee that a blockade of Germany would not be successful a second time.

Hitler's war speeches have been one long denunciation of Britain. While his oratory has been primarily intended to keep Germany spiritually mobilized against the "unvirtuous enemy" across the channel, it has also been aimed at Europe and America. It has been part of his plan to arouse anti-British sentiment among the American people and thereby drive a wedge between them and the English.

Infamous Warmongering

It is fine to speak of international peace and international disarmament, but I am suspicious of a laying down of arms, as long as the spirit is not disarmed. In the world the unique custom has grown up to divide the nations into so-called authoritarian, that is, disciplined states, and into democratic states. In the authoritarian, that is, the disciplined states, it is self-evident that one does not slander foreign people, one does not lie about them, and one does not agitate for war. But the democratic states are simply "democratic"—that is, there all those things may happen. In authoritarian countries warmongering is naturally prohibited, for their governments are indeed obliged to see to it that there is no warmongering. In the democracies, however, the governments have only one duty and that is to maintain democracy, that is, the freedom of being able if necessary to incite war.

Recently I called three of these international warmongers by name.* They felt offended, but not because of the principles involved,—no, only because I dared to call them by name. Mr. Churchill publicly declared that he is of the opinion that one must do away with the present regime in Germany with the aid of forces within Germany, forces which would thankfully place themselves at his disposal. If Mr. Churchill would associate less with emigrant circles, that is, with deported traitors who are paid by foreign countries, and more with Germans, then he would see the complete foolishness and stupidity of his talk. For I can only assure this man, who seems to live on the moon, of one thing. A force sufficient to turn against the present regime does not exist in Germany. In Germany there is only one power—the power of the German nation, in leadership and obedience to leadership, fully armed and equipped. I will not dispute with these gentlemen that we naturally have no right somehow to expect other peoples to change their constitutions. But as *Fuehrer* of the Germans I have the duty to consider this constitution and the possibilities that arise out of it.

A few days ago the representative of the leader of the English opposition declared in the Lower House that he makes no secret of the fact that he would welcome it if Germany and Italy were destroyed. Naturally I cannot prevent this man and his party from coming to power in the government in one or two years, but I can assure

*Hitler has reference to his speech in Saarbruecken on Oct. 9, 1938 in which he charged that Duff Cooper, Anthony Eden, and Winston Churchill were warmongers.

him that I will prevent his destroying Germany. And just as I am convinced that the German people will see to it that the plans of these gentlemen in regard to Germany never succeed, just so will Fascist Italy, too, I know, look after herself. I believe that for us all these international hopes can only be a lesson for us to stand firmly together and to stand fast at the sides of our friends. The more we build a single united community in Germany, the less will be the prospects of these warmongers. The closer we ally ourselves especially with that state that finds itself in the same position as we—with Italy—the more they will lose their desire to pick a quarrel with us.

If today we let the year 1938 once more pass before us in retrospect, then it can only fill us with the deepest pride and the greatest joy. Germany has grown larger in the most natural and from the moral viewpoint in the most indisputable way that exists. Millions of *Volksgenossen* whose only longing and whose only aim it was to be able to come back to Germany have now returned to our national community. They will henceforth help carry the Reich forward, and will serve it as loyal members, because they themselves could best realize what it means to be broken off and forsaken. This year is also a year of great obligations for us. From it we must accept the knowledge and make the resolve never again to forsake the successful way.

If the rest of the world speaks of disarmament, then we too are prepared for it, but with one condition—that first the warmongers are disarmed. As long as the others only speak of disarmament, while the infamous warmongering continues, we assume that they only want to steal our arms in order to prepare for us once again the fate of 1918-19. (Weimar, Nov. 6, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 7, 1938)

En Garde

In France and England there surely are men at the helm who want peace, but other men make no secret of the fact that they wish war against Germany. I am forced to speak soberly of this fact to the nation and draw the proper conclusions. Tomorrow Mr. Churchill could be Prime Minister. And when a British leader of the opposition explains, "We do not want to destroy the German people, but only the regime," then that is one and the same thing. For no one can destroy the regime without destroying the German people. When someone explains that he wants to free the German people from the regime, then I say to him: You are not qualified to decide for the German people. If there is indeed a human being who is qualified to decide for the

German people, then my gentlemen, British Members of Parliament, it is I! The German regime is an internal affair of the German people, and we forbid any schoolmasterly supervision. Beside that, I imagine that we have accomplished more than these gentlemen. Above all, we have put our state in order, something that one cannot say of all the countries in the world.

I am, accordingly, forced to consider also the mentality of those who are not governing today, but who could govern tomorrow, and who leave no doubt as to their inmost thoughts. The German people will understand why I am warning it and why I myself am determined to take all precautionary measures in order to be safe against any encroachments. At the same time I can furthermore give assurances that the German people will not give way to fear, let us say, of bombs from Mars or from the moon. Here, too, according to German custom, we will observe moderation. But I am resolved to strengthen the security of the Reich to the utmost, and I know that the whole German people will agree with me here. Without a doubt, that demands sacrifices. But it is better that we take these sacrifices upon ourselves rather than one day to make them to the rest of the world in the form of contributions, or, as one formerly called them, reparations. For us there can be only one resolve, which I expressed in Saarbruecken. We are desirous of peace at all times. We have not broken the peace, but we are also ready for defense at any time and indeed for manly and determined defense.

When someone now says to me, "You do not want to make history along the path of right, but on the road of force," then I can only say, "Present-day Germany did not refuse to achieve her rights through negotiations. Year after year we tried through negotiations to attain our rights." English Members of Parliament especially have no right to doubt this. For, through the channel of negotiations we also concluded a treaty with England.* We cannot help it if the others did not do the same. There is something that must be taken into consideration. National Socialist Germany will never go to Canossa. It is not necessary for us to do that. If the rest of the world stubbornly closed the doors to an attempt to allow right to be right through negotiation, then one should not be surprised if we insure ourselves of our rights through another way when we cannot get them through normal channels.

If these British officials now explain to the democratic world that

*Reference here is to the Anglo-German naval accord of June, 1935.

in the present year we have destroyed two democracies, then I can only ask: What essentially is democracy anyway? Who has the right to speak in the name of democracy? Did God hand the key to democracy to Messrs. Churchill and Duff Cooper? Is this inscribed on tables of law which are in the possession of the British Opposition? In our eyes democracy is a regime which is supported by the will of the people. According to the rules of parliamentary democracy I at one time became Chancellor in Germany—and indeed leader of by far the strongest party. According to the rules of parliamentary democracy I received formerly the unconditional majority and—Mr. Churchill may doubt it if he likes—today the unanimous approval of the German people. . . .

The English Parliamentary gentlemen will surely feel themselves very much at home in the British Empire, but in Central Europe they are not at home. Here they lack all knowledge of conditions, of past events and relationships. They will not and must not regard this statement of fact in the light of an insult, for after all we do not understand things in India very well, or in Egypt, or even in Palestine. I should consider it proper if these gentlemen at this moment would concentrate the vast knowledge which they possess and the unfailing wisdom which is characteristic of them upon, perhaps let us say, precisely this Palestine. They could operate there beneficially. For that which is occurring there smells quite damnably strong of force and very little of democracy. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1938; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 10, 1938)

An Unvirtuous Nation

If today an English statesman is of the opinion that all problems can and must be solved by candid discussions and negotiations, then I should like to tell that statesman just this: For that purpose an opportunity of fifteen years' duration existed before our time. If the world today says that the nations must be divided into virtuous nations and into such as are not virtuous—and that the English and the French belong to the virtuous nations, and that the Germans and the Italians belong to those that are not virtuous—then we can only answer that the judgment as to whether a people is virtuous or not virtuous can scarcely be delivered by a human being; such a judgment one must leave to the dear Lord. Perhaps this same British statesman will reply that God has already given the verdict, for He has given one-quarter of the world to the virtuous nations and He has taken

everything away from the non-virtuous. In answer to that the following question may be permitted: By what means have the virtuous nations obtained this quarter of the world for themselves? One must answer that they did not use virtuous methods. For 300 years this England behaved only as an unvirtuous nation, and now in her old age she speaks of virtue! Thus it came to pass that during this non-virtuous British period Englishmen subjugated almost one-fourth of the world, while 80,000,000 Germans, because of their virtue, have to live at the rate of 140 persons to one square kilometer.

Indeed, twenty years ago the question of virtue was not entirely clear to the British statesman insofar as it concerned conceptions of property. At that time it was still held compatible with virtue simply to take away the colonies of another people, who had acquired them through treaty or purchase, because one had the power to do so—this very power which now at any rate is considered as something abominable and contemptible. I have only one thing to say to these gentlemen. Whether they believe such things themselves or not we do not know. We assume, however, that they do not believe it. For if we should assume that they themselves really believe it, then we would lose every bit of respect for them.

For fifteen years Germany patiently bore her fate and destiny. I also attempted in the beginning to solve every problem through negotiations. In the case of every problem I made offers, and each time they were refused. There can be no doubt that every people possesses sacred interests, simply because they are identical with their life and their right to live. If today a British statesman demands that every problem in the realm of vital German rights must first be discussed in England, then I could demand just as well that every British problem must first be discussed with us. Certainly, this Englishman might give me the answer that Palestine is no affairs of the Germans. We do not want to have anything to do with Palestine. However, just as we Germans have no business in Palestine, so England has no business in Germany's living-space. If they now maintain that this is a question of general rights and law, then I could only accept this opinion if it were regarded as universally obligatory. It is said that we had no right to do this or that. I should like to raise the counter question: What right? Just to give one example. What right has England to shoot down Arabs in Palestine just because they stand up for their homeland? Who gives England this right? . . .

We have really no feeling of hatred against the Czech people. We have lived together for years. This, the English statesmen do not

know. They have no idea of the fact that the Hradschin Castle was not built by an Englishman but by a German, and that St. Veits Cathedral was not built by an Englishman but that it is the work of German hands. The French also were not active there. They do not know that already at a time when England was still very small, a German Emperor was paid homage on this hill, and that already one thousand years before me the first German king stood there and received the homage of this people. This, the English do not know; they could not know this; and they need not know it. It is sufficient that we know that it was thus, that for a thousand years this area belonged to the living-space of the German people. . . .

We have no intentions of waging war on other nations. The supposition is, however, that they leave us in peace as well. The German Reich is in no sense prepared to tolerate intimidation permanently, or even a policy of encirclement. I once made an agreement with England—the Naval Treaty. It was based upon the earnest desire, which we all possess, never to have to go to war against England. This desire, however, can only be a mutual desire. If this desire no longer exists in England, then the practical prerequisites for this agreement are therewith removed. Germany would even accept this with composure. We are so confident because we are strong, and we are strong because we are united, and because in addition we are looking ahead. (Wilhelmshaven, April 1, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 3, 1939)

Lasting Friendship

I regard it as impossible to achieve a lasting friendship between the German and the Anglo-Saxon peoples if the other side does not recognize that there are German as well as British interests, that just as the preservation of the British Empire is the object and life-purpose of Britons, so also is the freedom and preservation of the German Reich the life-purpose of Germans. A genuine lasting friendship between these two nations is only conceivable on the basis of mutual regard. The English people rule a great Empire. They built up this Empire at a time when the German people were internally weak. Germany had once been a great Empire.* At one time she ruled the Occident. As the result of bloody struggles, religious dissensions, and internal political disintegration, this Empire declined in power and greatness and finally succumbed to the forces of dissolution. But a s

*The reference here is to the Holy Roman Empire.

this old Empire appeared to have reached its end, the seeds of its rebirth were springing up. From Brandenburg and Prussia there arose a new Germany, the Second Reich, and out of it has grown at last the German People's Reich.

I hope that all English people understand that we do not possess the slightest feeling of inferiority to Britons. Our historical past is far too tremendous for that. England has given the world many great men and Germany no fewer. The severe struggle for the maintenance of the life of our people has, in the course of three centuries, cost a sacrifice in lives which far exceeds that which other peoples have had to make in maintaining their existence. If Germany, a country forever being attacked, was not able to retain her possessions but was compelled to sacrifice many of her provinces, this was due only to her unfortunate political development and to her importance which resulted from this development. That condition has now been overcome. Therefore, we Germans do not feel in the least inferior to the British people! Our self-esteem is just as great as that of an Englishman for England. The history of our people, which has covered approximately two thousand years, offers events and accomplishments enough to fill us with just pride.

Now, if England cannot understand our point of view, thinking perchance she may look upon Germany as a vassal state, then our love and friendly feelings have indeed been wasted on England. We shall not despair or lose heart on that account, but—relying on the consciousness of our own strength and on the strength of our friends—we shall then find ways and means to secure our independence without impairing our dignity. I have heard the statement of the British Prime Minister to the effect that he is not able to put any trust in German assurances. Under the circumstances I consider it a matter of course that we no longer expect him or the British people to accept a situation which in the normal course of events is conceivable only in an atmosphere of mutual confidence.

When Germany became National Socialist and thus paved the way for her national resurrection, I, of my own accord, in pursuance of my unswerving policy of friendship with England, made the proposal for a voluntary restriction of German naval armaments. That restriction, however, was based on one condition, namely, the will and the conviction that a war between England and Germany would never again be possible. This wish and this conviction are alive in me today. I am now, however, compelled to state that the policy of England is both unofficially and officially leaving no doubt about the fact that

such a conviction is no longer shared in London, and that, on the contrary, the opinion prevails there that no matter in which conflict Germany should some day be entangled, Great Britain would always have to take her stand against Germany. Thus, war against Germany is taken for granted in that country.

I most profoundly regret such a development, for the only demand I have ever made and shall continue to make on England is that she return our colonies. I always made it very clear that this would never become a cause of military conflict. I have always held that the English, to whom those colonies are of no value, would one day understand the German situation and would then value German friendship more than the possession of territories which, while yielding no real profit whatever to them, are of vital importance to Germany. Apart from this, however, I have never advanced a claim which might in any way have interfered with British interests or have become a danger to the empire and thus have meant any kind of damage to England. I have always made my demands within that sphere which is most closely connected with Germany's living-space and which is thus the eternal property of the German nation.

Since England today, both officially and in the press, upholds the view that Germany should be opposed under all circumstances and confirms this by the familiar policy of encirclement, the basis for the Naval Treaty has been removed. I have therefore resolved to send today a communication to this effect to the British Government. This is to us not a matter of mere material importance—for I still hope that we shall be able to avoid an armaments race with England—but an action of self-respect. Should the British Government, however, wish to enter once more into negotiations with Germany on this problem, no one would be happier than I at the prospect of still being able to come to a clear and straightforward understanding. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

British Encirclement

The Peace Treaty of Versailles . . . revealed the real war aims of the former British and French encirclement politicians. These aims were the theft of the German colonies, the destruction of German trade, the disturbance of all the foundations of German existence and thus of German life, the elimination of German political prestige and German might. Thus they were the same objectives that the British and French encirclement politicians have today. At that time, un-

fortunately, there were people in Germany who did not give credence to the extreme pronouncements of English newspapers and English politicians concerning the necessity of taking away German colonies and of destroying German trade—objectives which had already been announced in time of peace. The World War and the peace dictate of Versailles taught the German nation otherwise. What formerly was presented by apparently responsible publicists as the product of their own phantasy or their hate was nonetheless the aim of British policy, namely, the theft of the German colonies, the destruction of German trade, the disruption of the German merchant fleet, the unnerving and destruction of the Reich by power politics and, consequently, the political and physical extirpation of the German people. These were the aims of the British policy of encirclement before the year 1914. . . .

Here and now I want to assure you, my old comrades, that if the British policy of encirclement has remained the same as it was before the war, then to meet it German defense policy has been fundamentally altered. It has already changed in that today a civilian dressed up as a major no longer directs the affairs of the Reich, but rather a soldier who sometimes also wears civilian clothes. There are no longer any Bethmann-Hollwegs in the German Government today. I have taken pains to see to it that anyone who in any way has anything to do with the administration of the state is one hundred per cent man and soldier. Should I discover, however, that the conduct of any person fails to meet such a critical test, then I shall remove such a person from his position immediately, no matter who he may be.

The peace dictate of Versailles was not accidental. It was the goal of those who for years had tried to encircle Germany, and who finally attained their objective. We have no right to doubt now that the same policy is carried on today solely for the purpose of reaching the same end. It is our duty to tell the nation the naked truth of this situation, and to strengthen it to the utmost in its desire to defend itself and in its powers of defense. I believe that in this respect I am acting in accordance with those comrades who once, unfortunately at that time apparently without purpose, had to give their lives for Germany. Twenty-five years after the outbreak of the World War, and twenty years after the Treaty and dictate of Versailles, the German Government and behind it the whole German people can now for the first time again approach the graves of its heroes with uplifted heads. At least some of that which weakness . . . once sacrificed is again made good. (Kassel, June 4, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, June 5, 1939)

The Same Old Lies

In those days [the first World War] Mr. Churchill preached war and the government in Germany was weak; today, the same Mr. Churchill is again preaching war, but now there is a different government in Germany. Members of the present government fought the British during the last war; for this reason we are no more in awe of them than of anyone else. We have not the slightest sense of inferiority; we are, on the contrary, convinced of our superiority. The lies then were the same as the lies of today. For what did Britain fight in the Great War? In 1914 it was asserted, first, that Great Britain was fighting for the freedom of the smaller nations. Later, we saw how Great Britain dealt with the liberty of those smaller nations and how little her so-called statesmen cared for that liberty, how they oppressed minorities and mistreated nations, just as they do today, if it suits their purpose.

It was said then that Britain was fighting for justice. Britain had, of course, been fighting for justice for the past three hundred years and had received as a reward from Heaven about 40,000,000 square kilometers of this earth's surface and in addition the so-called "right" to rule over 480,000,000 souls. Thus does Heaven reward the nations which fight "only for the sake of justice," and especially such as fight for "self-determination of others." In 1914, they said, "The British Tommy is not fighting for his own interests, but for the right of self-determination of all nations." Then was certainly the time for Britain to declare the right of self-determination throughout the British Empire itself, but this was probably being reserved for the next war!

It was said too that Britain was fighting for "civilization." Civilization, of course, is only to be found in Britain, in the English mining districts, in the distressed areas of England, in Whitechapel, and in other districts stricken by poverty and social decay. Moreover, Britain entered the last war, as she had always done, for the sake of "humanity"! But one can always make use of the weapons of evil, provided one is fighting in a high and noble cause, as Britain has always done. They went even a step further and declared: We British are not fighting against the German people; on the contrary, we love the Germans; we, Messrs. Churchill, Chamberlain, and others, are fighting only against the regime which is terrorizing the German people. We British have only one object, to free Germany from the tyranny of her regime and thus bring happiness to the German people. With this object in view, the British were fighting mainly to free the German

nation from the burden of militarism and, indeed, to liberate it to such an extent that it would have no further need of any arms whatsoever. The British wanted to relieve Germany of her weapons. They said, too, that it was libelous to aver that the British objected to German trade. "On the contrary," said Mr. Churchill, "we desire free trade. We have nothing against Germany's merchant service." They asserted that it was a calumny to declare that Britain was casting an eye on the German colonies. Nobody had ever thought of such a thing. So they said in 1914, 1915, 1916 and even as late as 1918. . . .

From the British point of view, it was understandable that a nation of only 46,000,000 possessing 40,000,000 square kilometers of territory and ruling over 480,000,000 people would at length desire to have peace, after the British wars of conquest throughout the world had been going on for three centuries. "For three hundred years we have been subjugating one land after another and have conquered people after people. Now we rule the world and therefore peace shall reign at last!" That is obvious, and it was understandable that through the League of Nations, the process of stabilizing the *status quo* was to be carried out. To be sure, it all turned out very differently. Today, a British Cabinet Minister says with tears in his eyes, "How gladly would we come to an understanding with Germany, if only we could trust the word of the German Government." He has taken the words out of my mouth. How gladly would we come to an understanding with Britain, if only we could trust the word of the British Government. When, in the course of history, has a nation been more shamefully deceived and belied than has the German nation by British statesmen during the last twenty years? . . .

There are doubtless two types of Englishmen. Let us be just. Even in Britain there are many people who do not in their hearts approve of this whole hypocritical attitude and who wish to have nothing to do with it. But they have either been silenced or are unable to make themselves heard. For us, however, the decisive factor is, that although we sought these Britishers for years, we could not find them. You know how, my party-comrades, for nearly twenty years I concerned myself with the prospect of an understanding with Britain. What limitations did we not impose on Germany policy in order to come to such an understanding? The same is true with regard to France. What have we not renounced and abandoned? One thing, however, was obvious: No German Government can renounce Germany's right to live, and the National Socialist Government would be the last to make such a renunciation. On the contrary, we came into

being as a protest against the erstwhile renunciation of the right to live made by our democratic politicians. I will accordingly safeguard the existence and security of the German nation and the Reich, come what may.

I have never presumed to meddle in British or French affairs, but when an Englishman declares today, "We are responsible for the fate of the peoples in Central and Eastern Europe," I can only reply, "In that case, we are equally responsible for the fate of the peoples in Palestine, Arabia, Egypt, and even for the peoples of India." When, however, another Englishman says, "Our frontier is on the Rhine," and yet another comes and declares "Our frontier is on the Vistula," then I am forced to reply, "Gentlemen, see to it that you get back to the Thames; otherwise we will make it our business to get you there." The Germany of today is determined to safeguard her frontiers and to secure living-space for herself. I am thinking of a region where the British have brought none of their culture. We have penetrated no country where the British have carried their civilization before us. And in answer to Lord Halifax's statement, in his speech yesterday, that he upheld art and culture and that therefore Germany must be annihilated, we beg to reply that Germany had a culture of her own long before the Halifaxes knew the meaning of the word. During the past six years, more has been done for culture in Germany than has been done in Britain during the past century. Wherever we have gone we have found no monuments left by apostles of British culture, but only such bearing testimony to great Germans of the past. In vain I endeavored to find traces of British culture in Prague, Posen, Graudenz, Thorn, Danzig, and Vienna. Probably they are to be found in India or Egypt. . . .

This new Germany of ours has, as you know, no war aims in this conflict against France or Britain. In my last speech in which I made a final effort to extend the hand of friendship to Britain and France, I made this quite clear. If, despite this, they now attack us, it can have no connection with the problem of Austria, Czechoslovakia, or Poland; these problems are usually trotted out as the occasion demands, or else quickly forgotten.

The case of Poland certainly shows how little Britain is interested in the existence of such states, else she would have had to declare war on Soviet Russia, for Poland was approximately cut in half. But now the British say, "That is no longer decisive; now we have another war aim." First it was the freedom of Poland; then it was the extermination of Nazism, and then again it was guarantees for the future. It

will always be something different. They will wage war as long as they find someone who is ready to wage war for them, that is to say, to sacrifice himself for them. The old catchwords serve as a pretext. If they say that they want to champion the cause of liberty, then Great Britain could set the world a wonderful example by granting complete freedom at last to her own peoples. How noble this new British crusade would appear if it had only been introduced by a proclamation of freedom for the 350,000,000 inhabitants of India, or with a proclamation of independence and a general plebiscite for all the other British colonies! Instead, we see Britain oppressing these millions, just as she looked on while countless millions of Germans were being oppressed. We are therefore not moved when a British Cabinet Minister proclaims with unction that Britain pursues only her ideals and never selfish aims. Naturally, as I have already mentioned, the British have never fought for selfish aims. The good Lord has given these peoples and countries to Britain as a reward, simply because she has always fought so unselfishly. If they once again declare that they have no selfish aims, that is simply ridiculous! The German people is merely amazed—amazed at the limited intelligence of those who believe that little more than twenty years after such a monstrous breach of faith they can trick us again in the same way.

Or else they say that they are championing culture. We had better leave the question of Britain as a champion of culture alone. We Germans, at any rate, have no need to be impressed by British culture. Our music, our poetry, our architecture, our painting, our sculpture, are, to say the least, equal to those of Great Britain. It is my belief that one single German, Beethoven, for instance, has accomplished more in the realm of music than all the British musicians in the past and the present taken as a whole. We know, too, how to cultivate these arts better than the British ever can.

If they add that their aim in this war is to put an end to war once and for all—why, then, did they begin a war at all? For we are only at war because Britain wanted it! We are convinced that there will be wars as long as this world's goods are not justly distributed and their distribution is not undertaken in a spirit of justice and good will. How easily it could have been done! If they say today, "Oh, National Socialist Germany, we cannot give her colonies, much as we regret it. We should like to divide the world's raw materials, but we must give them to someone whom we can trust!" Well, gentlemen, there were other governments in Germany before us! They were governments by the grace of Britain; they were partly in the pay of Britain. These

governments at least, you must have trusted! Why were not this world's goods given to them if they were trustworthy? But there was no need to distribute anything at all; it would have been enough not to rob us of our property!

We too are of the opinion that this war must end, and that war must not and shall not return every few years. Therefore we consider it necessary that for this purpose the nations should confine themselves to their respective spheres of influence—in other words, that the state of affairs whereby a people takes it upon itself to play policeman and interfere the world over should cease. As far as Germany is concerned, at any rate, the British Government will come to recognize that an attempt to establish some sort of policy dictatorship over us will and must fail. Neither in the past nor in the present have we found the men of the British Government to be champions of culture—but on no account will we allow them to police us. . . .

Great Britain declares the present war to be the Second Punic War, but history has not yet determined who in this case is to be Rome, and who is to be Carthage. In the Great War Britain certainly was not Rome, for in the first Punic War the real victor was Rome; in the first Great War it was not Britain who was victorious, but other nations. In this second war, too, I can assure you, Britain will most certainly not be the victor. This time, as she will probably discover in due course, the Britain of the Great War is confronted by a different Germany, by a Germany that is inspired by dauntless determination and that answers the imbecilities of British slogan-makers with resounding laughter.

If a Briton attempts to tell us, "We are fighting for world freedom, for democracy, for culture, for civilization, for justice, and the like," the only answer to be heard in Germany is a loud burst of laughter. Besides, the generation which personally experienced the "sincerity" of such British war aims is still alive. Even supposing we have learned nothing new, we have, at any rate, forgotten nothing; as a matter of fact, we not only have forgotten nothing, but we have learned a great deal that is new as well. Every British balloon which floats across our lines and scatters a few more or less intelligent leaflets proves to us that everything in their world has been at a standstill for the past twenty years. Every echo from Germany, on the other hand, must prove to them that a movement of immense dimensions and of immense dynamic force has been at work here.

Britain does not want peace! So we were told again yesterday. In my speech before the Reichstag I already told you that I personally

had nothing more to say on this point. What we still have to say we shall communicate to Great Britain in the only language which she will be able to understand.

We regret that France has put herself at the service of British warmongers and has linked her fate with that of Great Britain. So far as Germany is concerned, we have never been afraid of a war on one front. Time was when we defended two fronts successfully. Now we have only one front, and we will defend it successfully, of that you can rest assured. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 10, 1939)

The House That John Bull Built

For 300 years Britain had gradually formed her so-called Empire, not through the free choice of the peoples concerned, or through spontaneous demonstrations and aspirations on their part, but by force. Thus the Empire was built up. War after war was waged; people after people were robbed of their liberty; state after state was crushed to create the structure called the British Empire. Democracy was merely used as a mask in this process. Behind this mask lurked the enslavement of peoples, the oppression and gagging of individuals. Even today this state does not dare to allow its various components to decide by popular vote whether, after centuries of British influence and infiltration, they want to remain voluntary members of the British domain. On the contrary! By the thousands, Egyptians and Indian nationalists find their way into dungeons and prisons. Concentration camps were not invented in Germany. They are British inventions. It was the intention of the British overlords, by such means, gradually to break the spirit of other peoples, to crush their national resistance until they willingly accepted the British yoke.

With this end in view, Britain employed yet another mighty weapon—that of lies and propagandistic phrases. There is a saying that when the Briton speaks of God, he means calico. This is still true today. How piously these people behave on the surface! Yet they have no compunction in involving nation after nation in conflicts for their own material interests. We can only say that seldom has human hypocrisy attained such a level as in the case of the Britain of today. In any event, after 300 blood-stained years of British history, today 46,000,000 Britons in the home country dominate approximately one-quarter of the earth, in area and in population. About 15,400,000 square miles is the share of 46,000,000 persons. It is important, my

Volksgenossen, that we should constantly reiterate this fact because shameless democratic liars stand up and maintain that the so-called totalitarian states wish to conquer the world. In reality, it is our old enemies who have always been the conquerors and aggressors.

In the course of its evolution, the British Empire has left nothing but a stream of blood and tears in its wake. Today, without doubt, Britain rules over a huge part of the earth's surface. But even now this world domination is not carried out by the strength of an idea, but essentially by brute force, and where this fails to suffice, by the power of capitalistic or commercial interests. The singular origin and development of the British Empire was possible only because the European continent never once united to react against it. This was shown very clearly by the elimination of the German Reich. For 300 years there was practically no Germany. While the British spoke of God but considered their business interests alone, the German people were waging long and bloody internal wars over matters of religious beliefs and differences. This was one of the reasons which made the growth of the British Empire possible. In exactly the same proportion as the German people spent their strength in internal struggles, and so disappeared as a factor in world affairs, Britain was able to form her Empire by robbing others.

However, it was not only Germany that was to all intents and purposes excluded from world competition during these three centuries. The same is true of Italy. Conditions there were similar to those in Germany, although it was not so much religious controversy as affairs of state and the various dynasties that prevented unity. The elimination of other great nations in the Far East, which similarly withdrew from the rest of the world and, without considering their own living space, sank into a voluntary isolation 400 years ago, took place for other reasons. In this way a political distribution of forces came into being which Britain described as the "balance of power," but which in reality meant a disorganized Europe for the benefit of Great Britain. For centuries it has been the object of British policy to maintain this state of disorganization, not, of course, under its real name, but under a more pleasant appellation. They spoke, not of calico and the disorganization of peoples, but of God and the "balance of power." In reality, the "balance of power" is a circumlocution for the helplessness of the European continent which enabled Britain to play off one state against another, time after time, as it suited her. It enabled her to keep nations involved in internal strife and to push herself for-

ward without hindrance in those parts of the world that could muster relatively little resistance. . . .

British world domination is also an illusion from an external point of view. There are new centers in the world. Giant states have grown up outside this European continent, or have extended far beyond it, states which cannot be attacked nor even menaced by Britain. The entire conception of British world domination is now based on the one principle of receiving aid from others against the Continent. Outside the European continent, British diplomacy can at most attempt to maintain its position by trying to play one power off against another in order to maintain at least some measure of its world might. In Europe, the awakening of the nations has already swept away the theory of the "balance of power," which is the principle of disorganization. The Germans have begun to grow into a single nation and in the midst of this disorganized continent the formation of the new Reich has started. South of us, Italy has gone the same way. New elements have come into being and have made the balance of power a chimera. It is this that is the real and deeper cause for the great war.

Since 1871, when the German peoples began to organize and formed a Reich under the genius of a great statesman—when the national renaissance of the German people, already slowly beginning to manifest itself, was realized in the form of national unity—it was Britain who began to make us the object of her hate. As early as 1871, or even in 1870, immediately after the battle of Sedan, British newspapers began to point out that this new structure was more dangerous to Britain than the old France had been. They hoped that Prussia might succeed in overcoming France in a long war, but they did not deem a national German renaissance or the evolution of a new German Reich built around Prussia as desirable.

Thus came the period from 1871 to 1914. Britain unswervingly agitated for war against Germany. She displayed her enmity toward Germany at every opportunity, until finally the Great War broke out—the work of a very small group of unscrupulous international rogues. Britain could carry on this World War only with the help of other countries. In this connection it is interesting to trace the whole course of British world policy for the last 400 years. First, war with Spain with the aid of the Dutch; then war with the Dutch with the aid of other European states, including France; then, war with France with the aid of Europe; finally, war with Germany with the aid of Europe and the rest of the world. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1941; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 1, 1941)

Churchill Has His War

My warnings against the night bombing of civilian populations advocated by Mr. Churchill were interpreted as a sign of German impotence. Churchill, the most bloodthirsty amateur strategist that history has ever known, actually saw fit to believe that the reserve displayed by the German Air Force for months was merely proof of its inability to fly by night. So for months this man ordered his hired scribblers to deceive the British people into believing that the Royal Air Force alone and none other could wage this kind of war and that thus ways and means had been found to force the Reich to its knees; namely in the ruthless onslaught of the British Air Force on the German civilian population and in the starvation blockade.

Again and again I uttered warnings against this specific type of aerial warfare, and I did so for over three and a half months. That these warnings failed to impress Mr. Churchill does not surprise me in the least. What does this man care for the lives of others? What is culture or architecture to him? When war broke out he stated clearly that he wanted to have "his war," even though the cities of England be reduced to ruins. Now he has his war. My assurance that from a given moment every one of his bombs would be returned a hundredfold if necessary failed to induce this man to consider even for a moment the criminal nature of his actions. He professes not to be in the least depressed. He even assures us that after such bombing raids the British people greeted him with joyous serenity, causing him to return to London refreshed by his visits to the stricken areas. Perhaps such sights strengthened Mr. Churchill in his firm determination to continue the war in this way. But we are no less determined to continue to retaliate a hundredfold if necessary and to go on doing so until the British nation at last gets rid of this criminal and his methods.

If Mr. Churchill deems it necessary from time to time to improve upon the impetus and impressiveness of his war by propaganda, I would have him know that we, too, are quite ready to adopt similar methods. The appeal to forsake me, made to the German nation by this fool and his satellites on May Day of all days, can be explained only as symptomatic of a paralytic disease or of a drunkard's ravings. His abnormal state of mind gave birth to his decision to transform the Balkans into a theater of war. For almost five years this man has been racing around Europe like a madman in search of something to set afire. Unfortunately he often found hirelings who opened the gates

of their countries to this international incendiary. He has succeeded, by a wave of false assertions and pretenses, in persuading the British people that the German Reich was completely exhausted by the campaign of the preceding year. He saw himself obliged to create a fresh conflagration in Europe to prevent an awakening to the truth. . . .

As a German and as a soldier I consider it unworthy ever to revile a brave enemy. Yet it seems to be necessary to defend the truth from the wild exaggerations of a man who as a soldier is a bad politician and as a politician is an equally bad soldier. Mr. Churchill, who started this conflict, is, just as in the case of Norway and Dunkirk, trying to say something that may sooner or later still be twisted about to resemble a success. I do not consider that honorable, but in his case I think it understandable. If another man had experienced as many defeats as a politician and as many catastrophes as a soldier he would not have remained in office six months unless he also possessed the sole gift that Mr. Churchill does possess, namely, the gift of lying with a pious expression on his face, and of distorting the truth until finally glorious victories are fabricated from the most terrible defeats. In this way Mr. Churchill may be able to throw dust in the eyes of his *Volksgenossen*, but he cannot eliminate the consequences of his defeats.

A British Army of 60,000 or 70,000 men was landed in Greece. Before the catastrophe, the same man maintained that it consisted of 240,000 men. The object of this army was to attack Germany from the South, defeat her, and from that point, as in 1918, to turn the tide of the war. The accomplice again chosen by Churchill and driven into misfortune by him—in this case Yugoslavia—was destroyed within barely two weeks after the beginning of hostilities. Scarcely three weeks later, the British troops in Greece had either been killed or wounded, taken prisoner, drowned, or driven off.

In my last speech I announced that wherever Britons might set foot on the Continent they would be attacked by us and driven into the sea. I have, therefore, prophesied more correctly than Mr. Churchill. Now, with his brazen effrontery, he asserts that this war cost us 75,000 lives, i. e., more than double the losses of the Western Campaign. In fact, he goes still further. He informs his seldom very intelligent *Volksgenossen* through one of his hirelings that, after having slain enormous masses of Germans, the British finally turned away from sheer abhorrence of the slaughter and, strictly speaking, withdrew for this reason alone. Thus, the Australians and New Zealanders would still be in Greece today if the Englishmen, with their rare mixture of lionlike bravery and childlike softheartedness had not

killed so many Germans that they finally withdrew horrified by their own heroic deeds, took to their ships, and sailed away. That is probably the reason why we found practically none but Australians and New Zealanders among the dead or among the prisoners. That is the sort of thing a so-called democratic people will swallow. (Berlin, May 4, 1941; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 5, 1941)

Perfidious Albion

Now we all know that ever since the internal disorganization of the European continent, England had been obsessed by a political doctrine which believed that the disruption of the Continent was the first prerequisite for the aggrandizement of the British Empire. Undoubtedly this idea which dominated English political activities was very fascinating. While Europe was bled white in innumerable internal wars, Great Britain succeeded with a minimum of sacrifice of blood in building a world-wide edifice. Despite the name of Empire which was given to this edifice, its character was as little comparable to Imperial Rome as an international commercial trust is comparable to a world-wide enterprise which creates new values. . . .

Although England was too weak to bring about the disruption of the Continent, she managed to profit by that disruption and, thanks to her insular position, she required only a minimum of strength, albeit a maximum of guile, to ensure Europe's continued weakness. Thus she was able to use her almost unimpaired strength to conquer another world. . . . Only a fool would deny that this development was of use to mankind. But it was equally stupid to assume that the British Empire would be able to maintain forever the so-called European balance of power. The racial components of the Continent, similar in blood and spirit, striving for unification, could not indefinitely be denied their union.

It was ridiculous to assume that in the event of a common danger threatening the peoples of Europe to the same extent, a union between the menaced countries could be prevented. All the wars which England has for centuries past waged against the Continent in uninterrupted sequence could be won by her only so long as purely political organisms of a dynastic character were fighting each other. As soon as the people began to see beyond dynastic interests, Britain's European policy was doomed. Despite many wars, England was unable to destroy the French National State forever; despite all her attempts, she failed to prevent the unification of the Italians; and despite all

interventions, the German Reich, through the will of the German peoples and the actions of great heroes, arose from its ruins as soon as it found in Bismarck's superior genius the man for the task. The greater the political consolidation of the European peoples and the firmer their conviction of their own worth, the more difficult was the maintenance of the European situation which, in the so-called balance of power, disguised the real ratio of strength. The idea that it would be possible by means of tricks and verbose arguments to keep the European nations in disruption by fighting each other was doomed to failure.

In the circumstances England could not continue to profiteer by the existing conditions; instead she was forced to become the active defender and permanent guarantor. Here the art of intrigue came to an end. She found she must fight with determination and ability. But this ability depended on the ever-growing strain on the British Empire and the increasing necessity for a sacrifice of blood to maintain the desired disruption of European peoples. The maintenance of the European balance of power, to be sure, originally helped England to save her own blood, thus placing her in a better position to cope with the tasks of her self-imposed world mission. But as soon as England was obliged to shed her own blood in Europe, the time had to come when the conservation of European disruption would require more of her strength than she could spare from the task of preserving her own Empire. Profound exhaustion after the Napoleonic Wars, which were mainly fought by continental forces, first heralded the gradual eclipse of the British doctrine of the European balance of power. It was not realized at that time that the British Empire needed the maintenance of a helplessly disrupted Europe to ensure its own existence. Such a state of affairs was able to continue only as long as there were no states of equal weight near the Empire which were likely to threaten it. As soon as the Russian colossus fought its way through from Europe to Asia and as far as the Far East, as soon as the United States of America became both independent of and unassailable by England and, furthermore, when the Japanese Empire, like Italy and Germany awakening from its sleep, became the dominant power in the Far East, the essential condition for the continued existence of the British Empire suffered a fundamental change. This structure could not be maintained indefinitely against Europe, but at best in cooperation with Europe.

When in 1914, despite long and sustained German efforts for peace, Britain declared war on the German Reich with a superior coalition

of Powers, she even temporarily weakened Germany in importance and in her European position, besides driving her from the rest of the world. Two facts, however, had to be admitted at the end of this bloody conflict. First, that it was only a matter of time before Germany would shake herself free from the imposed fetters. A nation which stood up to the whole world for four years as the result of swindles and lies and was forced by internal rebellion to go to Versailles was certain eventually not only to recognize the deception to which it had fallen prey but also to remove the results when its own strength and resources permitted. Second, the help for which England asked during that war irrevocably changed things. That is to say, the appeal of the English Government in its direst need to the United States gave that continent an economic and political importance which England herself will never be able to destroy. When England entered the Great War she fought for the Two-Power standard at sea and was not prepared to grant the German Reich a strength of five, or six, to ten. When England ended the war, as she believed, victoriously, Japan had taken Germany's place and the United States had taken England's. But the structure of the British Empire had not gained in internal strength through this fight; indeed, it began to weaken. Later for tactical reasons, the word Empire was replaced by the vague conception of Commonwealth; but this was merely making a virtue of necessity. When, during the period of the greatest military crises, help was begged with empty promises, it was clear that the bills would have to be met sooner or later. Neither the Indian nor the Arab world will ever forget the assurances which once induced them to make sacrifices to maintain the British Empire.

The fact that England emerged from the war seriously damaged economically, financially burdened and her blood exhausted, is a further proof that the first World War might prove a Pyrrhic victory and the father of further wars. Another similar war for the maintenance of the European balance of power—and England must inevitably lose her essential influence within her own Empire. That is to say, the strength wasted in the defense of an impossible European order is not now available to defend her own Empire. For this reason the present war can, and will, end only in catastrophe for the British Commonwealth. (Berlin, April 26, 1942; B.C.C.)

18

Pluto-Democracies

The Jewish-capitalistic world will not survive the twentieth century.

Berlin, Dec. 31, 1939

The conspiracy of international capitalism and Bolshevism . . . has repeatedly butchered mankind, torn it asunder inwardly, plundered it economically, and destroyed it politically.

Berlin, Jan. 30, 1943

The claim that "capitalistic war mongers" are responsible for World War II has been a potent weapon of Hitler's psychological warfare. Continuing the threadbare argument of the "have-not" nations versus the "haves," he has maintained that the world's wealth is unjustly divided, and that, as a result, war is inevitable. If the world has been divided by force, it can be redivided by force. The only prerequisite is military power, which is dependent upon productive industrialism, efficient labor, and ideological motivation. Here, in short, is a sworn foe of Marxism using a distorted version of Marxist phraseology to befuddle the German masses.

In contrast to the splendid organization of the German "people's community," Hitler has painted a heart-rending picture of the capitalist democracies. These nations, he has disclosed, hate Germany because of the dangerous example of her social principles. To complete his Marxian analysis, he has preached the overthrow of capitalism. German victory, he has ranted, will be the triumph of socialism over plutocracy.

But Hitler has not relied solely on the proletarian motif. He has explained the war on the basis of self-preservation—as a fight for life, for Germany's future. Should it be lost, he has warned, it would mean the end of the German people. There are only two possibilities: victory or extermination. And victory will mean both military success and national deliverance.

The suave unconcern with which Hitler has shed his coat of mail as World Protector against Bolshevism to don his mantle of Proletarian Deliverer—one of the more comic interludes in his career as a political magician—demonstrates his deep contempt for the mentality of his followers.

While most people admit that the world's wealth is unevenly distributed and that this inequity relates to the war, few have minds glib enough to accept World War II as Hitler's selfless crusade for world socialism.

The Haves and the Have-Nots

In actual fact the problem at the end of the war had become still more critical than it was before the war. Quite briefly, the problem was how can a just and sensible share in the world's wealth be assured to all great nations? For surely no one can seriously assume that, as in the case of Germany, a mass of 80,000,000 intelligent persons can be so permanently condemned as pariahs, or be forced to remain passive forever by having some ridiculous property titles based solely on former acts of force held up before them. And this is true not only of Germany but of all nations in a similar position. For it is quite clear that either the wealth of the world is divided by force, in which case this division will be corrected from time to time by force; or else the division is based on grounds of equity and therefore also of common sense in which case equity and common sense must also really serve the cause of justice and ultimately of expediency.

But to assume that God has permitted some nations first to acquire a world by force and then to defend this robbery with moralizing theories is perhaps comforting and, above all, comfortable for the "haves," but for the "have-nots" it is just as unimportant as it is uninteresting and lays no obligation upon them. Nor is the problem solved by the fact that a most important statesman simply declares with a scornful grin that there are nations which are "haves" and that the others on that account must now and forever be "have-nots."

These wearisome views may perhaps prevail as principles for the solution of social questions inside the capitalistic democracies, but the states which are really ruled by their peoples reject such theories in their domestic policy as well as in their foreign policy. No nation is born to be a "have-not," and no nation is born to be a "have." But the distribution of wealth in the world has been the result of historical development. It is conceivable that in the course of long periods of time nations in consequence of inner crises may seem to disappear temporarily from the arena of historical events. Yet to imagine that in Europe a people like the Germans or the Italians should disappear forever from the stage of history on which they had appeared on the basis of equality with other peoples, and indeed after being not only passive but also active forces in the shaping of civilization, is a most profound fallacy.

As far as Germany is concerned the situation is very simple. The Reich has 80,000,000 inhabitants; this means that there are over 135 persons to the square kilometer. The great German colonial posses-

sions, which the Reich once acquired peacefully by treaties and by purchase, have been stolen. This was contrary indeed to the solemn assurances given by President Wilson, which were the basic conditions on which Germany laid down her arms. . . .

What the German farmer manages to produce from the German soil is astounding and hardly believable. He deserves our highest thanks. Nature, however, sets the limit to any further increase in production. This means that if some change does not take place, German consumption power will find a natural limitation when the production of food supplies reaches its maximum. The situation which would then arise could only be overcome in two ways. First, by means of additional imports of foodstuffs, i. e., an increased export of German products; whereupon one must consider that the importation of at least some of the raw materials would be necessary for their manufacture, with the result that only a part of the export proceeds would be available for the purchase of foodstuffs; or second, by the extension of our nation's *Lebensraum*, so that within our domestic economy the problem of Germany's food supplies can be solved.

As the second solution is for the time being not yet feasible by reason of the continued blindness of the one-time victorious powers, we are forced to occupy ourselves with the first. In other words, we have to export in order to buy foodstuffs. Moreover, as these exports require raw materials, not all of which we ourselves possess, we are forced to export still more, in order to assure ourselves of additional raw materials for use in our industry. This necessity is consequently not of a capitalistic kind, as perhaps may be the case in other countries, but arises out of the uttermost need a nation can meet with, namely, the need for its daily bread. And when in this matter statesmen of other countries threaten us with I-do-not-know-what kinds of economic counter-measures, I can only give the assurance that in such a case a desperate economic struggle would ensue, which would be easy for us to carry out—easier for us than for the over-satisfied nations because the motive behind our economic war would be a very simple one. The German nation must live (that means, export) or die. And I can assure all the international skeptics that the German nation will not die, least of all for this reason, but that it will live. If need be it will place all the labor power of the new National Socialist community at the disposal of its leaders to begin such a struggle and to see it through. As for the leaders themselves, I can give the assurance that they are prepared to do their utmost. An ultimate and reasonable solution of this problem, however, will not be possible until human

reason is victorious over the greed of some nations, that is, until the fact is grasped that to sustain such an injustice is economically as well as politically not advantageous and that it is, indeed, insane. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Why They Hate Us

What they [the members of the British Government] hate is the dangerous example of our social labor legislation. They hated it before the Great War. They still hate it today. The object of their hate is this Germany with its social welfare, which is striving to do away with social injustice and class distinctions. They hate the Germany which, in the course of seven years, exerted itself to make a decent life for its people. They hate Germany for having solved the question of unemployment, which all their wealth failed to do. The Germany which gives its workers decent living quarters is what they hate, because they feel that their own people might be infected by the urge for similar advantages. They hate the Germany which celebrates the first of May as the day of honest work.

They hate the Germany which is struggling to raise its standard of living. This is the Germany which they hate, the Germany of a healthy people, the Germany which washes its children and sees to it that they are not overrun with vermin, which does not permit conditions to arise which even their own press is forced to denounce. This is the Germany they hate. It is their city magnates, their Jewish and non-Jewish international banking princes who hate us, because they see in this Germany a bad example that might stir up other people, including their own. They hate the Germany of our young, healthy, and active generation, and the Germany which looks after that generation.

Naturally, they hate our strength; they hate Germany on the march, unafraid of sacrifices. We were forced to realize how they hated us. We were compelled by their hate to adopt a Four-Year-Plan. By our Four-Year-Plan we deprived no one of anything. What do we take from others by manufacturing petrol and rubber from our coal, by making divers new substitutes for raw materials denied us? Nothing, nothing at all. On the contrary, they ought to be glad; they ought to tell themselves: At least they will not be a burden on our markets. If they make petrol themselves, they need not export in order to import. All the better for us. They fought our Four-Year-Plan simply because it set Germany on her feet. That was, and is, the only reason. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 10, 1939)

Capitalism the Culprit

The program of the National Socialist Movement, besides freeing the Reich from the innermost fetters of a small substratum of Jewish, capitalistic, and pluto-democratic profiteers, proclaimed to the world our resolution to shake off the shackles of the Versailles dictate. Germany's demands for this revision were a vital necessity and essential to the existence and honor of every great nation. They will probably one day be regarded by posterity as extremely reasonable. In practice, all these demands had to be carried through contrary to the will of the Franco-British rulers. We all regarded it as a sure sign of successful leadership in the Third Reich that for years we were able to effect this revision without a war. Not that, as the British and French demagogues asserted, we were at that time incapable of fighting. When, thanks to growing common sense, it finally appeared as though international cooperation might lead to a peaceful solution of the remaining problems, the agreement to this end signed in Munich on September 29, 1938, by the four leading interested states was not only not welcomed in London and Paris but was actually condemned as a sign of abominable weakness.

Now that peaceful revision threatened to be crowned with success the Jewish, capitalist warmongers, their hands stained with blood, saw their tangible pretext for realizing their diabolical plans vanish into thin air. Once again we witness the conspiracy of wretched, corruptible, political creatures and money-grabbing financial magnates, for whom war was a welcome means of furthering their business ends. The poison scattered by the Jews throughout the nations began to exercise its disintegrating influence on sound common sense. Scribblers concentrated upon decrying honest men who wanted peace as weaklings and traitors, and upon denouncing the opposition parties as the "fifth column," thus breaking all internal resistance to their criminal war policy. Jews and Freemasons, armaments manufacturers and war profiteers, international business men, stock exchange jobbers seized upon political hirelings of the desperado type who described war as something infinitely desirable. It was the work of these criminal persons that spurred on the Polish State to adopt an attitude that was out of all proportion to Germany's demands, still less to the attendant consequences. (Berlin, July 19, 1940; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 21, 1940)

Invidious Internationalism

Our people have high aims, far higher than merely winning the war. What we want to do is build a new state. And that is why others hate us so. They have said it often enough. They say, "But your social experiments are very dangerous. If that kind of thing begins to spread, and if our workers see it, it will be bad. It costs billions and earns nothing. There is no profit and no dividend to be gotten out of it. What good is it? We are not interested in such a development. We welcome everything that helps the materialistic progress of humanity—provided that such progress nets a profit. But social experiments—all the things you are doing—can only serve to awaken the greed of the masses and to pull us off our pedestal. You can hardly expect that of us."

We have been looked upon as the bad example; whatever we tried was no good because it was meant for the people. We have taken the road toward true social legislation and toward a sociological development which is hated in other countries. For they are plutocracies in which a very small clique of capitalists rules the masses and, naturally, cooperates closely with the international Jews and the Freemasons. We have known these enemies from the days of our internal struggle; it is the dear old coalition of the Weimar system.

They hate us on account of our social principles, and everything that we plan and carry out in that direction looks dangerous to them. They are convinced that this development must be destroyed. But I am convinced that the future belongs to this development, and that those states which do not follow it will sooner or later collapse. Unless they find a solution dictated by reason, the states which have social problems remaining unsolved will sooner or later end in chaos. National Socialism has prevented chaos in Germany.

You know our aims, and you know that we defend them persistently and with fixity of purpose—and that we shall achieve them. That is why all these international plutocracies, the Jewish newspapers, the stock exchanges of the world, hate us; that is why all the countries whose attitude is identical or similar are in sympathy with those democracies. It is precisely because we know that the fight is a struggle for the entire social foundation of our nation and is directed against the very substance of our life that, while we are fighting for these ideals, we must profess them again and again. (Berlin, Sept. 4, 1940; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Sept. 6, 1940)

Two Worlds in Conflict

I have stated that the world was unequally divided. American observers and Englishmen have found a wonderful expression for this fact. They say there are two kinds of peoples—the “haves” and the “have-nots.” We, the British, are the “haves.” It is a fact that we possess 16,000,000 square miles. And we American are also “haves,” and so are we Frenchmen. The others—they are simply the “have-nots.” He who has nothing receives nothing. He shall remain what he is. He who has is not willing to share it.

All my life I have been a “have-not.” At home I was a “have-not.” I regard myself as belonging to them and have always fought exclusively for them. I defended them and therefore I stand before the world as their representative. I shall never recognize the claim of the others to that which they have taken by force. Under no circumstances can I acknowledge this claim with regard to that which has been taken from us. It is interesting to examine the life of these rich people. In this Anglo-French world there exists, as it were, democracy, which means the rule of the people by the people. Now the people must possess some means of giving expression to their thoughts or their wishes. Examining this problem more closely, we see that the people themselves have originally no convictions of their own. Their convictions are formed, of course, just as everywhere else. The decisive question is who enlightens the people, who educates them? In those countries, it is actually capital that rules; that is, nothing more than a clique of a few hundred men who possess untold wealth and, as a consequence of the peculiar structure of their national life, are more or less independent and free. They say, “Here we have liberty.” By this they mean, above all, an uncontrolled economy, and by an uncontrolled economy, the freedom not only to acquire capital but to make absolutely free use of it. That means freedom from national control or control by the people both in the acquisition of capital and in its employment. This is really what they mean when they speak of liberty. These capitalists create their own press and then speak of the “freedom of the press.”

In reality, every one of the newspapers has a master, and in every case this master is the capitalist, the owner. This master, not the editor, is the one who directs the policy of the paper. If the editor tries to write anything that does not suit the master, he is ousted the next day. This press, which is the absolutely submissive and characterless slave of the owners, molds public opinion. Public opinion thus mo-

bilized by them is, in its turn, split up into political parties. The difference between these parties is as small as it formerly was in Germany. You know them, of course, the old parties. They were always one and the same. In Britain matters are usually so arranged that families are divided up, one member being a Conservative, another a Liberal, and a third belonging to the Labor Party. Actually, all three sit together as members of the family, decide upon their common attitude, and determine it. A further point is that the "elected people" actually form a community which operates and controls all these organizations. For this reason, the opposition in England is really always the same, for on all essential matters in which the opposition has to make itself felt, the parties are always in agreement. They have one and the same conviction and through the medium of the press mould public opinion along corresponding lines. One might well believe that in these countries of liberty and riches, the people must possess an unlimited degree of prosperity. But no! On the contrary, it is precisely in these countries that the distress of the masses is greater than anywhere else. Such is the case in "rich Britain."

She controls 16,000,000 square miles. In India, for example, 100,000,000 colonial workers with a wretched standard of living must labor for her. One might think, perhaps, that at least in England itself every person must have his share of these riches. By no means! In that country class distinction is the crassest imaginable. There is poverty—incredible poverty—on the one side, and equally incredible wealth on the other. They have not solved a single problem. The workmen of that country which possesses more than one-sixth of the globe and of the world's natural resources dwell in misery, and the masses of the people are poorly clad. In a country which ought to have more than enough and every sort of fruit, we find millions of the lower classes who have not even enough to fill their stomachs and who go about hungry. A nation which could provide work for the whole world must acknowledge that it cannot even abolish unemployment at home. For decades this rich Britain had 2,500,000 unemployed; rich America, 10,000,000 to 13,000,000 year after year; France, 6, 7, and 800,000. Well, my *Volksgenossen*, what then are we to say about ourselves?

It is self-evident that, where this democracy rules, the people as such are not taken into consideration at all. The only thing that matters is the existence of a few hundred gigantic capitalists who own all the factories and their stock and through them control the people. The masses of the people do not interest them in the least. They are interested in them just as were our bourgeois parties in former times—

only when elections are being held, when they need votes. Otherwise, the life of the masses is a matter of complete indifference to them. To this must be added the difference in education. Is it not ludicrous to hear a member of the British Labor Party—who, of course, as a member of the opposition is officially paid by the government—say, “When the war is over, we will do something in social respects”?

It is the members of Parliament who are the directors of the business concerns—just as used to be the case with us. But we have abolished all that. A member of the Reichstag cannot belong to a Board of Directors, except as a purely honorary member. He is prohibited from accepting any emolument, financial or otherwise. This is not the case in other countries. They reply, “That is why our form of government is sacred to us.” I can well believe it, for that form of government certainly pays very well. But whether it is sacred to the mass of the people as well is another matter.

The people as a whole definitely suffer. I do not consider it possible in the long run for one man to work and toil for a whole year in return for ridiculous wages, while another jumps into an express train once a year and pockets enormous sums. Such conditions are a disgrace. On the other hand, we National Socialists equally oppose the theory that all men are equals. Today, when a man of genius makes some astounding invention and enormously benefits his country by his brains, we pay him his due, for he has really accomplished something and has been of use to his country. However, we hope to make it impossible for idle drones to inhabit this country. I could continue to cite examples indefinitely. The fact remains that two worlds are face to face with one another. Our opponents are quite right when they say, “Nothing can reconcile us to the National Socialist world.” How could a narrow-minded capitalist ever agree to my principles? It would be easier for the devil to go to church and cross himself with holy water than for these people to comprehend the ideas which are accepted facts to us today. But we have solved our problems.

To take another instance where we are condemned: They claim to be fighting for the maintenance of the gold standard as the currency basis. That I can well believe, for the gold is in their hands. We too once had gold, but it was stolen and extorted from us. When I came to power, it was not malice which made me abandon the gold standard. Germany simply had no gold left. Consequently, quitting the gold standard presented no difficulties, for it is always easy to part with what one does not have. We had no gold. We had no foreign exchange. They had all been stolen and extorted from us during the

previous fifteen years. But, my *Volksgenossen*, I did not regret it, for we have constructed our economic system on a wholly different basis. In our eyes, gold is not of value in itself. It is only an agent by which nations can be suppressed and dominated.

When I took over the government, I had only one hope on which to build, namely, the efficiency and ability of the German nation and the German working man, the intelligence of our inventors, engineers, technicians, chemists, and so forth. I built on the strength which animates our economic system. One simple question faced me: Are we to perish because we have no gold; am I to believe in a phantom which spells our destruction? I championed the opposite opinion: Even though we have no gold, we have capacity for work. The German capacity for work is our gold and our capital, and with this gold I can compete successfully with any power in the world. We want to live in houses which have to be built. Hence, the workers must build them, and the raw materials required must be procured by work. My whole economic system has been built up on the conception of work. We have solved our problems while, amazingly enough, the capitalist countries and their currencies have suffered bankruptcy. Sterling can find no market today. Throw it at any one and he will step aside to avoid being hit. But our Reichsmark, which is backed by no gold, has remained stable. Why? It has no gold cover; it is backed by you and by your work. You have helped me to keep the mark stable. German currency, with no gold coverage, is worth more today than gold itself. It signifies unceasing production. This we owe to the German farmer, who has worked from daybreak till nightfall. This we owe to the German worker, who has given us his whole strength. The whole problem has been solved in one instant, as if by magic.

My dear friends, if I had stated publicly eight or nine years ago: In seven or eight years the problem of how to provide work for the unemployed will be solved, and the problem then will be where to find workers, I should have harmed my cause. Every one would have declared: The man is mad. It is useless to talk to him, much less to support him. Nobody should vote for him. He is a fantastic creature. Today, however, all this has come true. Today, the only question for us is where to find workers. That, my *Volksgenossen*, is the blessing which work brings. Work alone can create new work; money cannot create work. Work alone can create values, values with which to reward those who work. The work of one man makes it possible for another to live and continue to work. And when we have mobilized the

working capacity of our people to its utmost, each individual worker will receive more and more of the world's goods. . . .

I wish to put before you a few basic facts: The first is that in the capitalistic democratic world the most important principle of economy is that the people exist for trade and industry, and that these in turn exist for capital. We have reversed this principle by making capital exist for trade and industry, and trade and industry exist for the people. In other words, the people come first. Everything else is but a means to this end. When an economic system is not capable of feeding and clothing a people, then it is bad, regardless of whether a few hundred people say: As far as I am concerned it is good, excellent; my dividends are splendid. However, the dividends do not interest me at all. Here we have drawn the line. They may then retort: Well, look here, that is just what we mean. You jeopardize liberty. Yes, certainly, we jeopardize the liberty to profiteer at the expense of the community, and, if necessary, we even abolish it. British capitalists, to mention only one instance, can pocket dividends of 76, 80, 95, 140 and even 160 per cent from their armament industry. Naturally they say, "If the German methods grow apace and should prove victorious, this sort of thing will stop." They are perfectly right. I should never tolerate such a state of affairs. In my eyes, a six per cent dividend is sufficient. Even from this six per cent we deduct one-half and, as for the rest, we must have definite proof that it is invested in the interest of the country as a whole. In other words, no individual has the right to dispose arbitrarily of money which ought to be invested for the good of the country. If he disposes of it sensibly, well and good. If not, the National Socialist State will intervene. . . .

Two worlds confront each other today. We know perfectly well that if we are defeated in this war it would not only be the end of our National Socialist work of reconstruction, but the end of the German people as a whole. For without its powers of coordination, the German people would starve. Today the masses dependent on us number 120,000,000 or 130,000,000, of which 85,000,000 alone are our own people. We remain ever aware of this fact. On the other hand, that other world says: If we lose, our world-wide capitalistic system will collapse. For it is we who saved hoarded gold. It is lying in our cellars and will lose its value. If the idea that work is the decisive factor spreads abroad, what will happen to us? We shall have bought our gold in vain. Our whole claim to world dominion can then no longer be maintained. The people will do away with their dynasties of high finance.

They will present their social claims, and the whole world system will be overthrown.

I can well understand that they declare, "Let us prevent this at all costs; it must be prevented." They can see exactly how our nation has been reconstructed. You see it clearly. For instance, there we see a state ruled by a numerically small upper class. They send their sons to their own schools, to Eton. We have Adolf Hitler Schools or national political educational establishments. On the one hand, the sons of plutocrats, financial magnates; on the other, the children of the people. Etonians and Harrovians exclusively in leading positions over there; in this country, men of the people in charge of the state. These are the two worlds. I grant that one of the two must succumb. Yes, one or the other. . . . If the other [world] were to succumb, I am convinced that the nations will become free for the first time. (Berlin, Dec. 10, 1940; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 11, 1940)

A Socialized World Victorious

What offers I made to them [Germany's enemies]! How earnestly I begged them to be sensible and not to curtail the vital requirements of a great nation. How often I proved to them that they were acting senselessly and against their own advantage, that they were only harming themselves. What did I not do during those long years to pave the way for an understanding with them? It would never have been necessary to embark on an armament race if the others had not wanted to do so. I made one proposal after another. But every proposal that came from me immediately excited a certain international Jewish capitalistic clique, just as had been the case in Germany, my *Volksgenossen*, where every sensible proposal made by National Socialists was immediately turned down simply because of its origin. . . .

When the Saar plebiscite had taken place and the Saar territory rejoined us, we drew our conclusions. I thereupon renounced any further revision of Germany's western frontiers. The French adopted this as a matter of course. I pointed out to the French ambassador, however, that this was not the matter of course that they imagined. I told him that we were making a sacrifice for the sake of peace. We made the sacrifice; in return we expected at least peace. But the ruthlessness of the capitalistic plutocrats again rapidly came to the fore in these countries. It was promoted by émigrés who painted a ludicrous picture of the German situation, which one's opponent believed

because it was pleasant to believe it, and it was fed by the Jewish hatred.

This coalition of plutocratic interests, on the one hand, and instinctive Jewish hatred and émigré lust for revenge on the other, succeeded in confusing the world more and more by weaving webs of fine phrases and by agitating against the new German Reich with exactly the same devices they had employed against its predecessor. . . .

To the gentlemen on the other side [England] and those across the ocean [America] I say only this—the socialized world will be victorious in the end. Social conscience will begin to assert itself in all nations. They can wage wars for their financial interests, but these wars will, in themselves, finally pave the way for social revolutions within the nations. It is quite impossible to oblige hundreds of millions of people to submit themselves to the interests of a few individuals. The interests of humanity will be victorious over the interests of these small plutocratic businessmen. We already see signs that crises in this direction are in the offing elsewhere.

British labor leaders suddenly appear with “new” social ideas, as stale and out of date as any I can imagine. Gentlemen, put them back in their coffin. They are matters that we cast aside long ago. If you wish to know how to proceed along such lines you must not take a program that was modern with us in the eighties and nineties. You must come to us and study, gentlemen, if you want to learn how to go about your task. But even then, the very fact that now, suddenly, something of this kind should be proposed is sufficient. What then are these gentlemen actually waging war for? First of all, they say, to fight against National Socialism. The nations of the world must shed blood—so that the British can suddenly fish out the details of a program that lies in our ancestors’ bottommost dresser drawers. What is their reason? They could have had social gains much more cheaply. But it is proof that even there the peoples are beginning to stir. Trouble arose because someone—I think he was a colonel—declared that socially advanced Britain has no use for officers from the “lower classes.” Officers can be selected only from the “upper classes.” “The lower strata” are of no use in this respect.

Why, I ask, are they perturbed because he said such a thing? They should be annoyed that the fact exists, and not merely because someone has at last been indiscreet enough to say so. It is interesting to note that nobody was shocked that he presented actual facts. In England, only men of the upper crust can play important roles. That is what should annoy them; not the fact that someone has been silly

enough to let the truth slip out in wartime. If they want to know something, this class prejudice was abolished long ago in our country. Only a short time ago these people "proved" to us that our officers and generals were of no use because they were young and contaminated by National Socialism. In other words, they were in some way connected with the broad masses. Developments have shown where the best generals may be found, over there or over here.

If the war last much longer, it will be a great misfortune for Great Britain. The British will experience all sorts of things. And, perhaps, some day they will dispatch a commission to take over our program. It is this social Germany which this clique of Jews, financiers, and business czars hates the most. Regarding these people, our foreign policy and our internal and economic policies are absolutely clear and determined. There is but one definite goal: The good of the people. Whatever paths we follow must all end there. However, it is perfectly clear that we do not wish to destroy everything, that we must follow and stick to the right road cautiously. The Movement comprises not merely the brief existence of a single man. Early in our struggle I declared that National Socialism would determine Germany's future for thousands of years. It can no longer leave our minds. It will pass away only when the points of its program have become a matter of course.

Even after the war had begun, there were possibilities for an agreement. Immediately after the Polish campaign, I again offered my hand. I demanded nothing from France or Britain. Still, all was in vain. Immediately after the collapse in the West, I again offered my hand to Britain. Howls and shouts were my only reception. They literally spat on me. They were outraged. Very well, it is all in vain. Financial interests are victorious over the genuine interests of the people. The blood of nations must again serve the money of this small international group. Thus the fight started. Thus will it continue. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1941; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 1, 1941)

The End of the Gold Standard

It is intolerable for us to be the puppets of other nations and to have them prescribe for us, for example, what economic policy we are to pursue. We are carrying out the economic policy which is most advantageous to the German people. I am not persuading the others. If they want to sit on their money bags, let them do so. But when

they say, "You do the same," I shall take care not to buy dead gold with the productive power of German workmen. I purchase the necessities of life with the productive power of German workmen. The results of our economic policy speak for us, not for the gold standard people. For we, the poor, have abolished unemployment because we no longer pay homage to this madness, because we regard our entire economic existence as a production problem and no longer as a capitalistic problem. We placed the whole organized strength of the nation, the discipline of the entire nation, behind our economic policy. We explained to the nation that it was madness to wage internal economic wars between the various classes, in which they all perish together. Of course, a fundamental social principle was necessary to achieve this. It is today no longer possible to build up a state on a capitalistic basis. The peoples eventually begin to stir. The awakening of the peoples cannot be prevented by wars. On the contrary, war will only hasten it. Such states will be ruined by financial catastrophes which will destroy the foundations of their own former financial policy.

The gold standard will not emerge victorious from this war. Rather, the national economic systems will conquer. And these will carry on among themselves the trade that is necessary for them. Whether this does or does not suit a few gold-standard bankers in the world is quite immaterial. And if some of these gold bankers declare: We cannot tolerate your trading with this or that country, it is none of their business. In the future the peoples will decline to accept rules as to their trade policy laid down by a few bankers. They will follow the policy which is best adapted to their needs. (Munich, Feb. 24, 1941; *Berliner Boersen Zeitung*, Feb. 25, 1941)

Plutocratic Warmongers

On July 19, 1940, I convened the German Reichstag for the third time to render my account of that great success which you all remember. This meeting provided the opportunity of expressing the thanks of the nation to its soldiers, appropriate to the unique greatness of the event. Once again I seized the occasion to urge the world to make peace.

In the light of past experiences, I made it perfectly clear, however, that such hopes could be but small. The men who had wanted the war were certainly not inspired by any idealistic motives. The driving

force behind them was Jewish plutocratic capitalism to which they were bound and upon which they were consequently dependent. The billions already invested by these war speculators were clamoring for interest and amortization. They were therefore far from being depressed by the thought of a long war. On the contrary, they favored it.

But this capital, once invested in factories and machinery, needs time to become productive and certainly considerably more time to reach the dividend stage. From the very outset, therefore, nothing was more odious to these Jewish plutocratic war speculators than the thought that an appeal to the common sense of the nations might possibly at the last moment succeed in terminating the war without further bloodshed, thus limiting the profits of their invested millions. What I foresaw and prophesied at that time came to pass. My offer of peace was misconstrued as a symptom of fear and cowardice. Once again the sound common sense of the masses—who can never hope to profit from this war—was befogged by the warmongers of Europe and America who succeeded in conjuring up false pictures of new hopes. (Berlin, May 4, 1941; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 5, 1941)

Capitalistic Hyenas

It is almost a joke if today that man of the White House says "We have a world program and this world program is to give people freedom and the right to work." Mr. Roosevelt! Open your eyes! We have had that for a long time in Germany. Or else he says that measures against illness shall be taken. Get out of the garden of our Party program, these are National Socialist compounds, sir! This means heresy for a democrat. Or else he says, "We want the workers to have a holiday." You are rather late with this wish for we have already put that into practice, and we should have gotten much further if you had not interfered. Or else he says, "We want to increase prosperity, also for the broad masses." All these are things out of our program. Perhaps he might have been able to achieve that if he had not started a war, because we too did it without a war, before the war. No, those capitalistic hyenas did not even dream of doing a thing like that. All they see in us is a bad example. In order to have a decoy for their own peoples, they have now to delve into our Party program, and have to pick out some bits, these miserable bunglers—and even at that they do a bad job. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1942; B.B.C.)

Financial Strongholds

We all feel at this moment the grandeur of the times in which we are living. A world is being forged anew. While in the Far East the heroic Japanese people—provoked, abused, and economically strangled in the same way as the German and Italian peoples—is smashing with gigantic blows in the air, on land and on the sea the democratic-capitalistic strongholds, in Europe the conditions are being created for the true independence of that continent. It is unbearable to think that the life of hundreds of millions of people of the highest cultural value and greatest industry should be dependent forever on the will of a small criminal community of Jewish-capitalist world conspirators. . . . Only one solution is possible: To carry on this struggle until lasting peace is secured, that is, until the enemies of peace are destroyed. By solemnly proclaiming this decision we do full justice to the sacrifices made during the war of 1914-1918, and during the struggle of the National Socialist Movement and the resurrection of our people, and to those made, and to be made, during the present struggle. (Berlin, March 15, 1942; B.B.C.)

Money-Grubbing Exploiters

I am so confident when I meet any of the German soldiers fighting on the Eastern Front on their return home; I can ask any one of them: Have a look at our institutions, compare our homesteads, our settlements, our social institutions, with what you have seen over there! Compare this, my dear friend, and then tell us who has done it better and who, above all, has been more sincere in his intentions! Not one has yet returned who expressed any opinion but that if anywhere in the world a socialist state was about to become a reality, this happened in Germany alone. This, too, is a reason why that other world which represents capitalist interests is active against us. Those people there form a concern which presumes even today to govern, to direct, and if necessary to maltreat the world to suit private capitalist interest. If, for instance, a few days ago a British snobbish, perfumed lout, such as Mr. Eden, declared: We Englishmen have experience in governing, then one can only reply: In governing? No! In exploiting, in pillaging! What do you mean by experience in governing if a country inhabited by 46,000,000 people itself controlled 40,000,000 square kilometers of the globe, but had 2,500,000 unemployed at the outbreak of war? Where is the art of governing or, in-

deed, the art of leading? It is only unscrupulous exploitation. When this very man says, "We have a fine instinct for spiritual and material values"—yes, indeed they have; they have destroyed the spiritual values everywhere and the material values they have pinched! And they have pinched and appropriated them always only by brutal force. For in 300 years that nation over there has suppressed and subjugated state after state, one little nation and tribe after another. If they had really been such splendid rulers, they might have gone now, after the Indian peoples have expressly stated their desire that they should leave, they might have gone to wait and see whether the Indians would recall them. Prudently they did not go, though they knew so wonderfully how to rule. And in this matter all these exploiters see eye to eye, whether they are running about with a Marxist or a private capitalist cashbox. All they can do is to subjugate nations, merely to let them subsequently become a prey to misery.

Only a small handful of people who are, however, extremely rich—people of both Jewish and non-Jewish extraction—determine the world's fate in those parts. We may state confidently that Germany herself has witnessed an example of the ability of these people to govern. When in 1918 the Reich had collapsed, the deluded German nation in its blind faith turned to these people in the hope that it might perhaps get an indication from them of a way in which to escape from its misery. That was democratic Germany—not National Socialist Germany. For we should never have assumed power if democratic Germany had not been plundered and exploited in such a way. They tried to make another India of Germany, and to a large extent they succeeded. They managed in our country to bring about a state of affairs in which 7,000,000 people had no incomes whatsoever, and another 7,000,000 were merely part-time workers. They also managed to bring about a state of affairs in which not only tens but hundreds of thousands of farmers were driven from their ancient homesteads. Thanks to them, all economic life came to a standstill in our country and there was no such thing as social welfare work. Just as in India and elsewhere, they proved this in our country by their attempts at governing, and if this arch-ruffian Roosevelt—I have no better name for him—comes and says, "Europe must be saved by United States methods," I can only say that the gentleman might have had the good grace to save his own country; then he would have had no need to go to war. He would have been better advised to get rid of his 13,000,000 unemployed rather than to precipitate the world into war. But he did this precisely because he was unable to cope

with his internal problems and because he was out for plunder just as were his British allies, appreciating as he did not only spiritual but, above all, material values, since Roosevelt knows just as little of spiritual values, besides checks and suchlike, as the British.

Out of this "art of governing" of our enemies and its dreadful consequences in our democratic Germany, the National Socialist Movement gradually developed. If they had really made Germany happy at that time we should have had no reason, and I should have no cause whatsoever to devote myself to this work day by day, week by week, month by month, and year by year. All my old fellow-fighters know this. I was not idle during that time. . . . I traveled through the length and breadth of Germany from North to South and East to West and worked my fingers to the bone only to save my nation from this misery into which it had been plunged by these "rulers" of international capital.

The conspiracy of Jews and capitalists and Bolsheviks of that time, that conspiracy we were out to eliminate—and in the end we have eliminated it. But hardly were they eliminated when the other part of the world began once more with its encirclement. Once it was Imperial Germany, now it is National Socialist Germany. Then it was the Kaiser, now it is I. There is only one difference—that old Germany was theoretically imperial, but in reality it was totally disrupted. He who was then the Kaiser was a man lacking any strength to resist those enemies. But in me they have found an adversary who does not even think of the word capitulation. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1942; B.B.C.)

19

America and Roosevelt

It was a blessing for us when the gallant Japanese nation decided to reply to the insolent provocations of this lunatic [Roosevelt] in the only way possible before the conscience of her own people and of history.

Berlin, April 26, 1942

Roosevelt attacks North Africa, saying that he must protect it against Germany and against Italy. There is no need to waste a word on these lying phrases of that old cheat. He is without doubt the chief gangster of the whole coterie which opposes us.

Munich, Nov. 8, 1942

Hitler's foreign policy toward America has been one of the costliest failures of his entire career. The themes that had worked well elsewhere failed in the United States. By and large, his rantings about Bolshevism, the New Order, peace, and the Jews left America cold. Confused and vexed, he blundered from one line to another until he had established himself on the side of Japan and, finally, found himself at war with the "land of unlimited possibilities."

In his public speeches Hitler has never attacked the American people as a whole. He has been too eager to keep American opinion in the isolationist lull. Nor has he wanted to stimulate American opinion against him. On the other hand, he has tried to convince us that we have been the dupes of dangerous elements.

Hitler's treatment of President Roosevelt has changed with the needs of the moment. In replying, on May 17, 1933, to the President's general appeal for peace—an appeal made two days previously—Hitler was mild and conciliatory. Seemingly grateful to Mr. Roosevelt, he even welcomed America as a guarantor of European security. Six years later, however, he was no longer the parvenu Chancellor who needed to be gracious. The finale of his famous speech of April 28, 1939, was a sarcastic answer to another peace appeal which President Roosevelt had addressed to him and Mussolini less than two weeks earlier. With obvious pleasure and cutting irony, Hitler misrepresented the issues and distorted the facts. Less interested in clearing himself than in blackening Mr. Roosevelt, his digs at White House meddling were designed to encourage isolationist sentiment in the United States.

With the advent of war in 1939, Hitler continued his old tactics toward America. In spite of our aid to England and the President's clearly unfriendly attitude toward the Nazis, the Fuehrer became relatively silent. He blasted us neither with bombs nor words, for he was still counting on our isolation and internal differences. Even his war message of December 11, 1941, spared the American people; his invective concentrated on the President. In making the conflict "Roosevelt's war," he was hoping against hope to persuade us that that man in the White House had brought us to the brink of disaster. But as events have since demonstrated, he had misgauged the American people.

Why the U. S. Went to War in 1917

What reason, finally, did America have for going to war against Germany? Well, with the outbreak of the World War which Judah had desired for so long, all big Jewish firms of the United States became suppliers of war materials. They supplied the European "war market" to an extent they themselves had not dreamed of—a tremendous harvest! However, nothing satisfied the insatiable greed of the Jew. The venal press, therefore, dependent on the kings of the stock exchange, began an unparalleled propaganda campaign. A gigantic organization of press lies was built up. And again it is a Jewish concern, the Hearst Press, which set the tone in this agitation against Germany. The hatred of these "Americans" was not directed alone against commercial Germany, or even military Germany. It was directed particularly against social Germany, because Germany had so far kept herself from coming under the influence of the world trusts.

The old Reich had honestly tried to solve some of the social problems. After all, we could show steps in social development that no other country in the entire world could match. The main concern in the building of dwellings and factories was the question of hygiene, washrooms, light and air, in contrast to the November Republic, whose "housing bureaus" crowd people together in rabbit coops. Formerly suburban trains would take the worker for ten pfennig out to his little family garden, which he has since had to give up or neglect under the "care" of the November Republic, because either the train service has been discontinued altogether or the fares have gone up so high that he can no longer afford them. The old Reich built schools, hospitals, and scientific institutes which aroused the admiration and envy of the entire world. In the November Republic such cultural establishments are closing daily. The greatest danger of the former Reich for the world stock exchange was precisely the fact that it was conscious of social problems and did not permit itself to treat its people only as so many numbers.

This also explains why even in Germany itself the "comrades" under Jewish leadership fought against their own interests as well. This explains the agitation carried on throughout the entire world under the same slogan. This is why the Jewish-democratic press of America had to accomplish its masterpiece, namely, inciting a great peace-loving people which was as unconcerned about the wars of

Europe as it was about the North Pole, to take part, supposedly "in defense of civilization," in the most horrible of all wars. And all this in the name of civilization was accomplished by atrocity propaganda which shamefully and without parallel, was a trumped-up mass of lies and forgeries.* (Munich, April 13, 1923)

A Message to the American People†

I should like, first of all, to thank Mr. Randolph Hearst for giving me the opportunity to present to the American people through the Hearst press and the Columbia Broadcasting Company a short exposition of the course, meaning, and aims of the National Socialist Movement in Germany.

The National Socialist Movement is today the largest political party in Germany. In the year 1919, just a few months after the end of the World War, a few men including myself founded a small political association which included only seven members. There was no one among us of any prominence, no one who had heretofore played a role in political life. A year later the membership was sixty-four men and women. A year after that, 3,070; a year later, 7,000. In 1923 the Party numbered about 30,000 members. After a short period of persecution and suppression the Party came forth again under my leadership and already in 1927 it had over 70,000 members; in 1930, 8,500,000 voters; and today it is unquestionably the largest party in Germany with a constituency of between 14,000,000 and 15,000,000.

This was a tremendous victory march, the like of which there is no parallel in German political history. The reasons for this great development are as follows. In the year 1918 the German people suffered the most severe and most frightful collapse in all history. All existing political parties were more or less responsible for this catastrophe. It seemed necessary to me that a new party should be built out of the young generation, a party which, as far as the Ger-

**Adolf Hitler's Reden*, herausgegeben von Dr. Ernest Boepfle, Munich, 1934, pp. 47-48.

†Hitler was supposed to have broadcast this short speech to the United States on Friday night, Dec. 11, 1931. According to the Nazis, the Bruening Government interfered at the last minute and prevented the broadcast. The full text of the speech appeared in the issue of the *Voelkischer Beobachter* cited above. A translation of the speech was also published in various Hearst newspapers. The other newspapers in the United States, however, gave it only passing notice.

man people and the rest of the world were concerned, could not be burdened with anything.

At the time of the foundation of our Movement, Germany stood for the first time on the brink of Bolshevism. From that day on, the Movement had as its first principle the prevention, under any circumstances, of a development which would surrender such a great people as the German people to Bolshevism and therewith to cultureless barbarism.

We were convinced already twelve years ago, as we are today, that the victory of Communism in Germany would be the beginning of a general world catastrophe. The political, cultural and economic life of the civilized nations is so interwoven that a blow directed against Germany would undeniably be immediately felt beyond her borders. All the hopes for the recovery of the world from the present suffering and shame would have to be buried at that moment when the Red Soviet flag would be carried from Moscow as far as Hamburg and Heidelberg. The effects on the world would be inconceivable.

The struggle against this danger is a tremendous and difficult one. The political and economic treatment of Germany prescribed by an unreasonable hate since the dictate of Versailles is responsible for breeding over 6,000,000 full-fledged Communists among us, who declare themselves the advance guard of the world revolution from Moscow. In America Communism is as yet comparatively insignificant. If there were in America in the same ratio [as in Germany] 12,000,000 Communists with the same tendencies and the same objectives, then America would understand the necessity of our Movement and America would then take up the struggle against this world pest with the greatest determination.

In view of this great danger I should like to hope, as a German National Socialist, that out of an inner impulse for self-preservation, America will also be sympathetic toward our struggle and that America will help in removing at least some of the causes of Bolshevism. As a National Socialist, I believe that it is not enough merely to liquidate war on the fields of battle, but that war must also disappear from the daily life of the nations. The perpetuation of war hatred by the Treaty of Versailles leads to the disintegration of the solidarity of nations and therewith to world revolution.

Our Movement embodies the youth of a people of 70,000,000, whose importance for the general culture of the world is attested alone by such names as: Albrecht Durer, Hans Holbein, Bach, Haendel, Beethoven, Mozart, Schubert, Wagner, Kant, Goethe, Schiller,

Schopenhauer, and others. For what does the world hold us responsible, to justify treatment which brands us forever as a nation of second rank, and to subject us again, under certain circumstances, possibly tomorrow, to French colored troops as a force of occupation in the Rhineland? If the world supports such degradation, then the world should not be surprised if as a result the specter of Bolshevism looms forth.

I know war. My Movement wants peace for Germany and peace for Europe. We do not understand by this, however, that through the tyranny of French armaments, tranquility should not return to Europe and the world. French militarism along with Russian Bolshevism represents today one of the greatest dangers for the peaceful development of mankind.

My Movement recognizes every private debt made by one merchant to another. The right, however, to burden a people out of political motives with tribute for an indefinite length of time and therewith force a people to bankruptcy—this the National Socialist Movement will never acknowledge.

My Movement is not a Movement of desperation but a Movement of hope. We believe that we can come to power in Germany by strictly legal means. Our motto then will be: We will give to the world that which we rightfully owe to the world, and we guarantee to the German people that which is necessary, for its life as a sovereign nation. We want nothing more than a Monroe Doctrine for all German men, women and children under the motto: Germany for the Germans. (*Voelkischer Beobachter*, Dec. 13/14, 1931)

*America as a Guarantor of Peace**

The proposal made by President Roosevelt, of which I learned last night, has earned the warmest thanks of the German Government. Germany is prepared to agree to this method of surmounting the international crisis, for we are also of the opinion that no permanent economic reconstruction is possible unless the disarmament question is solved. The German Government is prepared to participate unselfishly in this work of bringing order into the political and economic relationships of the world. As I stated at the outset, Germany is also convinced that there is today only one great task—to safeguard the peace of the world.

*This excerpt was Hitler's answer to the appeal for peace which President Roosevelt made on May 16, 1933 to the rulers of fifty-four nations.

I feel obliged to state that the reason for the present armaments of France and Poland can under no circumstances be fear on the part of those nations of a German invasion. Such apprehension could be justified if Germany possessed modern offensive weapons. Germany, however, does not possess such modern offensive weapons at all; she has neither heavy artillery nor tanks nor bombing airplanes nor poisonous gases. The only nation therefore which might justifiably fear invasion is the German nation, which not only may not possess offensive weapons, but is also restricted in the right to defensive weapons and is even forbidden to erect frontier fortifications. Germany is at all times prepared to renounce offensive weapons if the rest of the world does the same. Germany is prepared to agree to any solemn pact of non-aggression because she does not think in terms of attack, but only of her security.

Germany would welcome the possibility suggested in President Roosevelt's proposal of bringing the United States into European relations as a guarantor of peace. This proposal is a ray of comfort for all who wish to cooperate sincerely in the maintenance of peace. We have no more earnest desire than to contribute to the complete healing of the wounds caused by the war and the Treaty of Versailles. Germany does not wish to take any other path than that recognized as justified by the treaties themselves. The German Government wishes to come to a peaceful agreement with other nations on all difficult questions. Germany knows that in any military action in Europe, even if completely successful, the sacrifice would be out of all proportion to any possible gains. (Berlin, May 17, 1933; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, May 18, 1933)

Bellicose Democracies

In certain democracies it is apparently one of the special prerogatives of politico-democratic life to cultivate an artificial hatred of the so-called totalitarian states. A flood of reports, partly misrepresentations of the facts, partly pure invention, are released with the idea of stirring up public opinion against nations which have done nothing to harm the other nations, have no desire to harm them, and which indeed have for decades been the victims of harsh injustice themselves. When we defend ourselves against such agitators as Mr. Duff Cooper, Mr. Eden, Mr. Churchill, or Mr. Ickes and the rest, our action is denounced as an encroachment on the sacred rights of the democracies. According to the way these agitators see things,

they are entitled to attack other nations and their governments, but no one is entitled to defend himself against their attacks. I need hardly assure you that as long as the German Reich continues to be a sovereign state, no English or American politician will be able to forbid our government to reply to such attacks. The arms that we are forging are our guarantee for all time to come that we will remain a sovereign state. Our choice of friends will help determine this too. Actually the assertion that Germany is planning an attack on America could be disposed of with a mere laugh. And one would prefer to pass over in silence the incessant agitations of certain British war-mongers. But we must not forget the following factors: First, owing to the political structure of these democratic states it is possible that in a few months' time these worst war-mongers might themselves hold the reins of government in their hands. Second, we therefore owe it to the security of the Reich to bring home to the German people in good time the truth about these men. The German nation has no feeling of hatred towards England, America, or France; all it wants is peace and quiet. But these other nations are continually being stirred up by their Jewish and non-Jewish agitators. Should the war-mongers achieve what they are aiming at, our own people would be landed in a situation for which they would be psychologically quite unprepared and which they would thus fail to grasp. I therefore consider it necessary that from now on our propaganda and our press should always make it a point to answer these attacks, and above all to bring them to the notice of the German people. The German nation must know who the men are who by hook or crook want to bring about a war.

It is my conviction that these people are mistaken in their calculations, for when once National Socialist propaganda is devoted to the answering of these attacks we will succeed just as we succeeded inside Germany herself in overcoming, through the convincing power of our propaganda, the Jewish world-enemy.

The nations will in a short time realize that National Socialist Germany wants no enmity with other nations, that all the assertions as to our intended attacks on other nations are lies—lies born of morbid hysteria or of a mania for self-preservation on the part of certain politicians. The nations will also realize that in certain states these lies are being used by unscrupulous profiteers to salvage their own finances. They must realize too, that above all, international Jewry hopes in this way to satisfy its thirst for revenge and gain,

and that these lies are the grossest defamation which can be inflicted upon a great and peace-loving nation.

Never, for instance, have German soldiers fought on American soil, unless it was in the cause of American independence and freedom; but American soldiers were brought to Europe to help strangle a great nation which was striving for its freedom. Germany did not attack America, but America attacked Germany, and, as the Committee of Investigation of the American House of Representatives concluded, from purely capitalist motives, without any other urgent cause. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

Peaceful Relations

Our relations with the United States are suffering from a campaign of defamation. This is carried on to serve obvious political and financial interests, which, under the pretense that Germany threatens American independence and freedom, is endeavoring to stir up an entire continent against the European states which are nationally governed. We all believe, however, that this does not reflect the will of the millions of American citizens. We believe, despite all said to the contrary by a gigantic Jewish-capitalistic propaganda through the press, the radio and the films, that they cannot fail to realize that there is not a word of truth in all these assertions. Germany wishes to live in peace and on friendly terms with all countries, including America. Germany refrains from any intervention in American affairs and likewise decisively repudiates any American intervention in German affairs.

The question, for instance, as to whether Germany maintains economic relations and does business with the countries of South and Central America, concerns nobody but them and ourselves. Germany, at any rate, is a great and sovereign country and is not subject to the supervision of American politicians. Quite apart from that, however, I feel that all states today have so many domestic problems to solve that it would be a stroke of good fortune for the nations if responsible statesmen were to confine their attentions to their own problems.

As far as Germany is concerned, I know from my own experience that the demands made by the work that lies before us here are so great as almost to exceed the powers of wisdom and energy at the disposal of one man. Speaking in the names both of myself and all

my collaborators, I can therefore assure you that we feel that our life's work consists exclusively in the care and maintenance of our own people and Reich, both of which can look back on a glorious history that is more than a thousand years old. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Jan. 31, 1939)

*White House Meddling**

The President of the United States of America has addressed a telegram to me, the curious contents of which you are already familiar with. Before I, the addressee, actually received this document, the rest of the world had already been informed of it by radio and newspaper reports, and numerous commentaries in the organs of the democratic world press had already generously enlightened us as to the fact that this telegram was a very skillful tactical document, destined to impose upon the states in which the people govern, the responsibility for the war-like measures adopted by the plutocratic countries. In view of these facts, I decided to summon the German Reichstag so that you, gentlemen, might have an opportunity of hearing my answer first and of either confirming that answer or rejecting it. But in addition, I considered it desirable to keep to the method of procedure initiated by President Roosevelt and to inform the rest of the world, on my part and by our own means, of my answer. . . .

As I indicated at the beginning of my address, the world was informed on April 15, 1939, of the contents of a telegram which I myself did not see until later. It is difficult to classify this document or to place it in any accepted category. I will therefore attempt, gentlemen, to present to you—and so to the whole German people—an analysis of the contents of this amazing document and in your name and in the name of the German people to give the appropriate answers to it.

Mr. Roosevelt is of the opinion that I too must realize that throughout the world hundreds of millions of human beings are living in constant fear of another war or even a series of wars. This, he says, is of concern to the people of the United States, for whom he speaks, as it must also be to the peoples of the other nations of the entire Western Hemisphere.

*This long peroration was Hitler's answer to the message which President Roosevelt sent to the *Fuehrer* and the Duce on April 15, 1939.

In reply to this it must be said, first of all, that this fear of war has undoubtedly existed among mankind from time immemorial, and justifiably so. For instance, after the Peace Treaty of Versailles, fourteen wars were waged between 1918 and 1938 alone, in none of which Germany was concerned, but in which states of the "Western Hemisphere" in whose name President Roosevelt also speaks, were indeed concerned. In addition there were in the same period twenty-six violent interventions and also sanctions which were carried through by means of bloodshed and force. Germany played no part whatever in these either. Since 1918 there have been six instances in which the United States alone has carried out military intervention. Since 1918 Soviet Russia has engaged in ten wars and military actions involving force and bloodshed. Again, Germany was concerned in none of these, nor was she responsible for any of these. In my opinion it would be a mistake to assume that the fear of war which haunts European and non-European nations alike can at this time be traced back to actual wars.

The reason for this fear lies exclusively in unbridled agitation on the part of the press, an agitation as mendacious as it is base in the circulation of vile pamphlets against the heads of foreign states and in the artificial spreading of panic. In some cases this goes so far that interventions from another planet are believed possible and scenes of desperate alarm ensue. I believe that as soon as the governments responsible impose upon themselves and their journalistic organs the necessary restraint and truthfulness as regards the relations of the various countries to one another, and in particular as regards internal events in other countries, the fear of war will disappear at once and the tranquility which we all so much desire will be realized.

In his telegram Mr. Roosevelt expresses the belief that every major war, even if it were confined to other continents, must have serious consequences not only while it lasts, but for generations to come.

Answer: No one knows this better than the German people. For the Peace Treaty of Versailles imposed burdens on the German people which could not have been paid off in a hundred years, although it has been proved conclusively by American teachers of constitutional law, historians, and professors of history that Germany was no more to blame for the outbreak of the war than any other people. But I do not believe that every conflict need have disastrous consequences for the world, that is, for the whole of mankind, provided that it is not systematically drawn into such conflicts by the obliga-

tions of a network of nebulous pacts. For centuries in the past and—as I pointed out at the beginning of my answer—in the course of the last decades too, the world has experienced a continuous series of wars. Now if Mr. Roosevelt's assumption were correct, the sum total of the outcome of all these wars would have already imposed a burden on humanity which it would have to bear for millions of years to come.

Mr. Roosevelt declared that he had already appealed to me on a former occasion for a peaceful settlement of political, economic, and social problems without resort to arms.

Answer: I myself have always been an exponent of this view and, as history proves, have settled necessary political, economic, and social problems without force of arms—without even resorting to arms. Unfortunately, however, this peaceful settlement has been made more difficult by the agitations of politicians, statesmen, and newspaper representatives who were neither directly concerned or even affected by the problems in question.

Mr. Roosevelt believes that the "tide of events" is once more bringing the threat of arms with it, and that if this threat continues, a large part of the world is condemned to common ruin.

Answer: As far as Germany is concerned, I know nothing of this kind of threat to other nations, although I read lies about such a threat every day in the democratic newspapers. Every day I read of German mobilizations, of the landing of troops, of extortions—all this in connection with states with whom we are not only living on the most peaceful terms, but with whom we are also in many cases the closest friends.

Mr. Roosevelt believes further that in case of war the victorious, the vanquished and the neutral nations will all suffer alike.

Answer: During the entire twenty-year period of my political activity I supported this point of view. This I did at a time when responsible statesmen in America, unfortunately, could not bring themselves to make the same admission in regard to their participation in the Great War and the nature of its final outcome.

Mr. Roosevelt believes that in the end it lies with the leaders of the great nations to preserve their peoples from this impending disaster.

Answer: If that is true, then it is culpable neglect, not to use a stronger word, if the leaders of nations in authority fail to control their newspapers which agitate for war, and thus save the world from the threatening calamity of an armed conflict. I cannot under-

stand, either, why these responsible leaders, instead of cultivating diplomatic relations between nations, make these relations more difficult and indeed disturbing by recalling their ambassadors when there is apparently no reason for such action.

Mr. Roosevelt declared finally that three nations in Europe and one in Africa have seen their independent existence terminated.

Answer: I do not know which three nations in Europe are meant. Should it be a question of the provinces reincorporated in the German Reich, I must call the attention of Mr. Roosevelt to an historical error. It is not now that these nations have sacrificed their independent existence in Europe, but rather in 1918. At that time, in violation of solemn promises, their logical ties were torn asunder and they were made into nations which they never wished to be and never had been. They were forced into independence which was no independence at all, but at most only dependence upon an international foreign world which they detested.

Moreover, as to the allegation that one nation in Africa has lost its freedom—that, too, is erroneous. It is not a question of one nation in Africa having lost its freedom. On the contrary, practically all the original inhabitants of that continent lost their freedom and have been made subject to the sovereignty of other nations through the medium of bloodshed and force. Moroccans, Berbers, Arabs, Negroes, and the rest have all fallen victim to the might of foreign powers, whose swords do not bear the label “made in Germany” but the label “made by democracies.”

Mr. Roosevelt then speaks of the reports which he admittedly does not believe to be correct, but which state that still further acts of aggression are contemplated against other independent nations.

Answer: I consider every such unfounded insinuation as an attempt against the tranquility and peace of the world. I also see in it an effort calculated to alarm smaller nations or at least to put them on edge. If Mr. Roosevelt really has specific instances in mind in this connection I would ask him to name the states which are threatened with aggression and to name the aggressor in question. It will then be possible by means of a few brief declarations to refute these monstrous charges.

Mr. Roosevelt states that the world is plainly approaching the time when the present situation will end in a catastrophe unless a rational way of guiding events is found. He also declares that I have repeatedly asserted that I and the German people have no desire for war and that if this is true there need be no war.

Answer: I should like to point out in the first place that I have not waged war; second, that for years I have expressed my abhorrence of war and, no less, of warmongers; and, third, that I do not know for what purpose I should even wage a war. I should appreciate it if Mr. Roosevelt would give me some explanation in this regard.

Mr. Roosevelt is also of the opinion that the peoples of the world could not be convinced that any governing power has any right or reason to inflict the consequences of war on its own or any other people except in an unequivocal case of self-defense.

Answer: I should think that every reasonable human being is of this opinion, but it seems to me that in almost every war both sides claim that theirs is a case of unquestionable self-defense. I do not believe there is an authority in this world, including President Roosevelt himself, who could decide this question unequivocally. There is hardly any doubt, for example, that America's entry into the Great War was not a case of unquestionable home-defense. A research committee set up by President Roosevelt himself has examined the causes of America's entry into the Great War, and reached the conclusion that the entry ensued chiefly for reasons that were exclusively capitalistic. Nevertheless, no practical conclusions have been drawn from this fact. We should like to hope, then, that at least the United States will in the future act according to this noble principle, and will not go to war against any country except in an obvious case of self-defense.

Mr. Roosevelt says further that he does not speak from selfishness, fear, or weakness, but with the voice of strength and friendship for mankind.

Answer: If this voice of strength and friendship for humanity had been raised by America at the proper time, and particularly if it had had any practical value, then at least that treaty, namely the dictate of Versailles, which became the greatest source of confusion for mankind in all history, could have been prevented.

Mr. Roosevelt declares further that it is clear to him that all international problems can be solved at the conference table.

Answer: Theoretically one ought to believe that this could be possible, for common sense would in many cases justify certain demands on the one hand and show the compelling necessity of compromise on the other. For example, by the logic of common sense and the general principles of higher human justice, indeed, according to the laws of divine will, all peoples ought to have an equal share in the world's goods. It ought not then to happen that one people

needs so much space to live in that it cannot get along with fifteen inhabitants to the square kilometer while others are forced to sustain 140, 150 or even 200 on the same area. In any event these fortunate peoples should not curtail the living space allotted to those who are already suffering, by robbing them, for example, of their colonies. I should therefore be more happy if these problems could really find their solution at the conference table.

My skepticism, however, is based on the fact that it was America herself who gave sharpest expression to her mistrust in the effectiveness of conferences. For the greatest conference of all time was without doubt the League of Nations. This authoritative body, representing all the peoples of the world, created in accordance with the intentions of an American President, was supposed to solve the problems of humanity at the conference table. The first state, however, which withheld its support from this great work was the United States—the reason being that President Wilson himself even then cherished the greatest doubts of the possibility of really being able to solve decisive international problems at the conference table.

We honor your well-meant expression of opinion, Mr. Roosevelt, but over against your opinion stands the actual fact that in almost twenty years of activity, the greatest conference in the world, the League of Nations, has not been able to solve one single decisive international problem. Contrary to Wilson's promise, Germany was prevented for many years by the Peace Treaty of Versailles from participating in this great world conference. In spite of this most bitter experience there was one German Government that believed that it should not follow the example of the United States but that it should accept a seat at this conference table. It was not until after years of purposeless participation that I resolved to follow the example of America and likewise withdraw from this largest conference in the world. Since then I have solved my people's problems, which, like all others, were unfortunately not solved at the conference table of the League of Nations—and I solved them without exception by means other than armed conflict.

Apart from this, however, as already mentioned, numerous other problems have been brought before world conferences in recent years without any solution having been found. But if your conviction that every problem can be solved at the conference table is true, then, Mr. Roosevelt, all nations, including the United States, have been led in the past 700 or 800 years either by blind men or by criminals. For all statesmen, including those of the United States and especially

her greatest statesmen, molded the history of their respective countries, not at the conference table, but by reason of the strength of their people. The freedom of North America was not achieved at the conference table any more than the conflict between the North and the Southern Confederacy was decided there. I will not mention the innumerable struggles which finally led to the subjugation of the North American continent as a whole. I mention these points only for the sake of showing that your view, Mr. Roosevelt, although undoubtedly deserving of all respect, is not confirmed by the history either of your own country or of the rest of the world.

Mr. Roosevelt continues that it is no answer to the plea for peaceful discussion for one side to plead that, unless they receive assurances beforehand that the verdict will rest in their favor, they will not lay aside their arms.

Answer: Do you believe, Mr. Roosevelt, that if the ultimate fate of nations is in the balance, a government or the leaders of a people will lay down their arms or surrender them before a conference, simply in the blind hope that the other members of the conference will be wise enough, or rather clear-sighted enough, to reach the right decision? Mr. Roosevelt, there has been only one country and one government which has acted in accordance with the recipe you extol in such glowing terms, and that country was Germany. The German nation, trusting in the solemn assurances of President Wilson and in the confirmation of these assurances by the Allies, once laid down its weapons and went unarmed to the conference table. It is true that as soon as the German nation laid down its arms, there was no question of an invitation to a conference table, but in violation of all assurances, the German nation was made the victim of the worst breach of promise of all time. Then one day, instead of clearing up at the conference table the greatest confusion in all history, the world's most cruelly dictated treaty brought about still more horrible confusion.

But the representatives of the German people, which had laid down its arms, trusting in the solemn assurances of an American President, were not even received, though they came to accept the terms of the dictated treaty. After all, they were the representatives of a nation which, at least, had held out with infinite heroism against a whole world for four years in the struggle for its liberty and independence. They were subjected in even greater degradations than can ever have been inflicted on the chieftians of Sioux tribes. The German delegates were insulted by the mob; stones were thrown at

them, and they were dragged like prisoners, not to the council table of the world but before the tribunal of victors; and there, at the pistol's point, they were forced to undergo the most shameful subjection and plundering that the world had ever known. I can assure you, Mr. Roosevelt, that I am steadfastly determined to see to it that not only now but for all time to come no German shall ever again enter a conference defenseless, and that at all times and forever every representative of Germany must and will have behind him the united strength of the German nation, so help me God.

The President of the United States believes that in conferences as in courts it is necessary that both sides enter in good faith, assuming that substantial justice will accrue to both.

Answer: German representatives will never again enter a conference that is for them a tribunal. For who is to be the judge there? At a conference there is no accused and no prosecutor but two contending parties. If their own good sense does not bring about a settlement between the two parties, they will never surrender themselves to the verdict of other Powers whose interests are wholly foreign to theirs. Incidentally, the United States herself declined to enter the League of Nations and to become the victim of a court which was able, merely by a majority vote, to give a verdict adverse to individual interests. But I should be much obliged to President Roosevelt if he would explain to the world what the new World Court is to be like. Who will be the judges? According to what procedure are they to be selected? On what responsibility will they act? And above all, to whom can they be made accountable for their decisions?

Mr. Roosevelt believes that the cause of world peace would be greatly advanced if the nations of the world were to give a frank statement relating to the present and future policy of their governments.

I have already done this, Mr. Roosevelt, in innumerable public speeches. And in the course of this present meeting of the German Reichstag, I have again—as far as this is possible in the space of two hours—made a statement of this kind. I must, however, decline to give such an explanation to anyone other than to the people for whose existence and life I am responsible, and who, in their turn, alone have the right to demand that I account to them. Nevertheless, I give the aims of German policy so openly that the entire world can listen to them. These declarations of policy, however, are without significance for the outside world as long as it is possible for the press to

falsify and cast suspicion on every statement, to question it, or to drown it with a new wave of lies.

Mr. Roosevelt believes that, because the United States as one of the nations of the Western Hemisphere is not involved in the immediate controversies which have arisen in Europe, I should therefore be willing to make such a statement of policy to him, as the head of a nation so far removed from Europe.

Answer: Mr. Roosevelt therefore seriously believes that the cause of international peace would really be furthered if I were to make a public statement on the present policy of the German Government to the nations of the world. But how does Mr. Roosevelt come to single out the head of the German nation to make such a statement without the other governments being invited to make a statement of their policy as well? I believe that it is not appropriate to make such a statement to the head of any foreign state, but rather that such statements should be made preferably to the whole world, in accordance with President Wilson's proposal for the abolition of secret diplomacy. Hitherto I was always not only prepared to do this, but, as I have already said, I have done it all too often. Unfortunately, the most important statements concerning the aims and intentions of German policy have in many so-called democratic states either been withheld from the people or distorted by the press.

If, however, President Roosevelt thinks that he is entitled to address such a request in particular to Germany or to Italy, because America is so far removed from Europe, we on our side might, with the same right, inquire of the President of the American Republic concerning the aim of American foreign policy and concerning the principles upon which that policy is based, for example, in the case of Central and South American states. In this event Mr. Roosevelt would certainly have every right to refer to the Monroe Doctrine and to decline to comply with such a request as an interference in the internal affairs of the American continent. We Germans support a similar doctrine for Europe—and, above all, for the territory and interests of the Greater German Reich. Moreover, I would obviously never take the liberty of addressing such a request to the President of the United States of America because I assume that he would most probably, and rightly so, consider such a presumption as tactless.

The American President further declares that he would then communicate information received by him concerning the political aims of Germany to other nations now apprehensive as to the course of our policy.

Answer: How has Mr. Roosevelt learned which nations consider themselves threatened by German policy and which do not? And how is Mr. Roosevelt in a position, with the enormous amount of work which he must have to do in his own country, to determine of his own accord all the inmost thoughts and feelings of other peoples and their governments?

Finally, Mr. Roosevelt asks that assurances be given him that the German armed forces will not attack, and, above all, not invade the territory or possessions of the following independent nations which he lists by name: Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Great Britain, Ireland, France, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Poland Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Russia, Bulgaria, Turkey, Iraq, Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Iran.

Answer: In the first place, I have taken the trouble to ascertain from the states mentioned whether they feel themselves threatened, and, what is most important, whether this inquiry by the American President, was addressed to us at their suggestion or at least with their consent. The reply was in all cases negative and in some instances strongly so. It is true that there were certain states and nations which have been mentioned from whom I could not request such information because they themselves—as, for instance, Syria—are at present not in possession of their freedom, but are under occupation by the military agents of democratic states and consequently deprived of their rights. Apart from this fact, however, all states bordering on Germany have received much more binding assurances and particularly more binding proposals than Mr. Roosevelt asked from me in his curious telegram.

Should there be any doubt, however, as to the value of these general and specific declarations which I have so often made, then any further statement of this kind, even if addressed to the American President, would be equally worthless. For in the final analysis it is not the value which Mr. Roosevelt attaches to such statements which is decisive but the value attached to these statements by the countries in question. I must also draw Mr. Roosevelt's attention to one or two other historical errors. He mentions Ireland, for instance, and asks for a statement to the effect that Germany will not attack Ireland. Now, I have just read a speech delivered by Mr. de Valera, the Irish Prime Minister, in which, strangely enough and contrary to Mr. Roosevelt's opinion, he does not charge Germany with oppressing Ireland but reproaches England with subjecting Ireland to continu-

ous aggression. And with all due respect to Mr. Roosevelt's insight into the needs and cares of other countries, it may nevertheless be assumed that the Irish Prime Minister would be more familiar with the dangers which threaten his country than would the President of the United States.

Similarly, the fact has obviously escaped Mr. Roosevelt's notice that Palestine is at present occupied not by German troops but by the English; that the country is undergoing restriction of its liberty by the most brutal resort to force; that it is being robbed of its independence and that it is suffering the cruelest maltreatment for the benefit of Jewish interlopers. The Arabs living in that country would therefore certainly not have complained to Mr. Roosevelt of German aggression, but they are voicing a constant appeal to the world, deploring the barbarous methods by which England is attempting to suppress a people who loves its freedom and is merely defending it. This, too, is perhaps a problem which in the American President's view should be solved at the conference table, that is, before a just judge, and not by physical force or military methods, not by mass executions, not by the burning of villages, not by blowing up houses, and so on. For one fact is certain. In this case England is not defending herself against a threatened Arab attack, but as an uninvited interloper she is endeavoring to establish her power in a foreign territory which does not belong to her. A whole series of similar errors which Mr. Roosevelt has made could be pointed out, quite aside from the difficulty of military operations on the part of Germany in states and countries, some of which are anything from 2,000 to 5,000 kilometers away from us.

In conclusion I have the following statement to make. The German Government is, in spite of everything, prepared to give each of the nations named an assurance of the kind desired by Mr. Roosevelt, on condition of absolute reciprocity, provided that such a state wishes it and itself addresses to Germany a request for such an assurance, together with correspondingly acceptable proposals. In the case of a number of states included in Mr. Roosevelt's list, this question can probably be regarded as settled from the very outset, since we are already either allied with them or at least united by close ties of friendship. As for the duration of these agreements, Germany is willing to make terms with each individual state in accordance with the wishes of that state. But above all I should not want to let this opportunity pass without giving to the President of the United States assurances regarding those territories which naturally give him most

cause for apprehension, namely, the United States herself and the **other** states of the American continent. And I here solemnly declare **that** all the assertions which have in any way been circulated concerning an intended German attack on or invasion of American territory are rank frauds and gross untruths, quite apart from the fact that such assertions, as far as the military possibilities are concerned, could only be the product of the most absurd imagination. . . .

According to the solemn pledges once given Germany, pledges which found their confirmation even in the Peace Treaty of Versailles, our disarmament was supposed to be the first step after which it would be possible for the rest of the world to disarm without a feeling of danger. In this respect, as in all others where Germany believed that promises would be kept, she was disgracefully deceived. All attempts to induce the other states to disarm, pursued in negotiations at the conference table over a period of years, as is well known, came to nothing. This disarmament would have been just and sensible and would have fulfilled pledges already given.

I myself, Mr. Roosevelt, have made any number of practical proposals for consultation and tried to initiate a discussion of these factors in order to effect a general limitation of armaments to the lowest possible level. I proposed a maximum strength of 200,000 for all armies, likewise the abolition of all weapons of offense, of bombing planes, of poison gas, and the like. The attitude of the rest of the world, unfortunately, made it impossible to carry out these plans, although Germany herself was at the time completely disarmed. I then proposed a maximum strength of 300,000 for armies. This proposal met with the same negative result. I then submitted a great number of detailed disarmament proposals—in each case before the forum of the German Reichstag and thereby before the whole world. It never occurred to anyone even to discuss the matter. Instead, the rest of the world began to increase still more their already enormous armaments. Not until after the final rejection of my proposals of 1934, suggesting 300,000 as the maximum strength, did I give the order for German rearmament, and this time on an intensive scale. Nevertheless, I do not want to be an obstacle in the way of disarmament discussions at which you, Mr. Roosevelt, intend to be present. I would ask you, however, not to appeal first to me and to Germany but rather to the others. I have had the benefit of much practical experience and I shall remain skeptical until reality has taught me otherwise.

Mr. Roosevelt assures us further that he is prepared to take part in discussions to consider the most practical manner of opening up

avenues of international trade to the end that every nation of the world may be enabled to buy and sell on equal terms in the world market, as well as to possess assurances of obtaining the raw materials and products necessary for a peaceful economic life.

Answer: It is my belief, Mr. Roosevelt, that it is not so much a question of discussing these problems theoretically as of removing in practice the barriers which exist in international trade. The worst barriers, however, lie in the individual states themselves. Experience so far shows, at any rate, that the greatest world economic conferences have been shipwrecked simply because the various countries were unable to maintain order in their own internal economic systems, or else because they brought uncertainty into the international financial market by currency manipulations, and especially by causing continual fluctuations in the value of their currencies to one another. It is likewise an unbearable burden for world economic relations that it should be possible in some countries, for one ideological reason or another to conduct a wild boycott campaign against other countries and their goods, and so in effect eliminate them from the market.

It is my belief, Mr. Roosevelt, that it would be a great service if you, with your great influence, would begin with the United States in the removal of those barriers which obstruct world trade. For it is my conviction that if the leaders of nations are not even capable of regulating production in their own countries or of removing boycotts pursued for ideological reasons, which can do so much damage in trade relations between countries, there is much less prospect of achieving any really fruitful step towards the improvement of economic relations by means of international agreements. There is no other way to guarantee the equal right of all to buy and sell in the world market. Furthermore, the German people has made very concrete demands in this regard and I would appreciate it very much if you, Mr. Roosevelt, as one of the successors of the late President Wilson, would use your efforts to redeem those promises on the basis of which Germany once laid down her arms and placed herself in the hands of the so-called victors. I am thinking less of the countless millions extorted from Germany in the form of so-called reparations than of the return of the territories stolen from Germany.

Germany lost approximately 3,000,000 square kilometers of territory in and outside of Europe, although the whole German colonial empire, in contrast to the colonies of other nations, was not acquired by means of war but solely through treaties or purchase. President Wilson solemnly pledged his word that the German colonial claim like

all others would receive the same just examination. Instead of this, however, the German possessions were given to nations who already had the largest colonial empires in all history, while our people were subjected to great care and anxiety, which are now—as they will continue to be in the future—particularly pressing. It would be a noble act if President Franklin Roosevelt were to redeem these promises made by President Woodrow Wilson. This, above all, would be a practical contribution to the moral consolidation of the world and the improvement of its economic conditions.

Mr. Roosevelt also stated in his conclusion that the heads of all great governments are in this hour responsible for the fate of humanity and that they cannot fail to hear the prayers of their peoples to be protected from the foreseeable chaos of war. It is clear that I too would bear a responsibility in this respect.

Mr. Roosevelt, I fully understand that the vastness of your nation and the immense wealth of your country allow you to feel responsible for the history of the whole world and for the fate of all peoples. My sphere, Mr. President, is considerably smaller and more modest. You have 130,000,000 people on 9,500,000 square kilometers. You possess a country with enormous riches, with all mineral resources, where land is fertile enough to feed half a billion people and to provide them with every necessity. I took over the leadership of a state which was faced by complete ruin, thanks to its trust in the promises of the outside world and to the evil government of its own democratic regime. In this state there are roughly 140 people to each square kilometer—not fifteen, as in America. The fertility of our country cannot be compared with that of yours. We lack numerous minerals which nature has bestowed on you in unlimited quantities. Billions of German savings accumulated in gold and foreign exchange during many years of peace were extorted from us. We lost our colonies. In 1933 I had in my country 7,000,000 unemployed, a few million part-time workers, millions of impoverished peasants; our trade was destroyed, our commerce ruined; in short, general chaos prevailed. Since that time, Mr. Roosevelt, I have only been able to fulfill one task. I cannot feel myself responsible for the fate of the world because the world took no interest in the pitiful fate of my own people.

I have regarded myself as called upon by Providence to serve my own people alone and to deliver them from their frightful misery. Thus, for the past six and one-half years, I have lived day and night for the single task of awakening the powers of my people, in the face of our desertion by the rest of the world, and of developing these

powers to the utmost and of utilizing them for the salvation of our national community. I have conquered chaos in Germany, reestablished order, increased production tremendously in all branches of our national economy; by strenuous efforts substitutes have been produced for numerous materials which we lack; the way has been prepared for new inventions; transportation has been developed; magnificent roads have been built; canals have been dug; and gigantic new factories have been constructed. I have also attempted to enhance the development of our social community and to promote the education and culture of my people. I have succeeded in finding useful work once more for the 7,000,000 unemployed who so appeal to the hearts of us all. I have succeeded in keeping the German peasant on his soil in spite of great difficulties and in saving the land itself for him. I have succeeded in causing German trade to flourish once again, and in promoting transportation to the utmost.

To protect them against the threats of the outside world, I have not only united the German people politically but also rearmed them. I have likewise endeavored to destroy that treaty page for page which in its 488 articles contains the vilest oppression which has ever been inflicted on men and nations. I have brought back to the Reich the provinces stolen from us in 1919; I have led back to their native country millions of Germans who were torn away from us and were in abject misery; I have reestablished the thousand-year-old historic unity of German living-space—and, Mr. Roosevelt, I have endeavored to attain all this without bloodshed and without bringing to my people and so to others the misery of war.

I, who twenty-one years ago was an unknown worker and soldier of my people, have attained this, Mr. Roosevelt, by my own energy and can therefore claim a place in history among those men who have done the utmost that can be fairly and justly demanded from a single individual. You, Mr. Roosevelt, have an immeasurably easier task in comparison. You became President of the United States in 1933 when I became Chancellor of the Reich. Thus, from the very outset, you became head of one of the largest and wealthiest states in the world. It is your good fortune to have to sustain scarcely fifteen people per square kilometer in your country. At your disposal are the most abundant natural resources in the world. Your country is so vast and your fields so fertile that you can insure for each individual American at least ten times more of the good things of life than is possible in Germany. Nature at least has given you the opportunity to do this.

Although the population of your country is scarcely one-third

larger than that of Greater Germany, you have more than fifteen times as much room. And so you have time and leisure—on the same huge scale as you have everything else—to devote your attention to universal problems. Consequently the world is undoubtedly so small for you that you perhaps believe that your intervention can be valuable and effective everywhere. In this way, therefore, your concern and your suggestions cover a much larger and wider field than mine. For my world, Mr. President, is the one to which Providence has assigned me and for which it is my duty to work. Its area is unfortunately much smaller. It only comprises my people. But I believe I can thus best serve that which is in the hearts of all of us—justice, well-being, progress, and peace for the whole community of mankind. (Berlin, April 28, 1939; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, April 29, 1939)

U-Boats in Waiting

We are established on this continent; and where we are established no one will ever dislodge us. We have created impregnable bases. When the time comes, we shall strike decisively. History will prove to these gentlemen [the British] in 1941 that we have made full use of our time.

What are they hoping for? New help? America? I can only say that from the very outset we have acted with reserve. It is obvious to everyone who has any respect for the truth that the German nation has no quarrel with the American people. Germany has never claimed any interests on the American continent, apart from the fact that Germans took part in the struggle for the liberation of that continent. If states of that continent try to enter the European conflict, the situation will quickly alter. Then Europe will defend itself. Let there be no mistake—whoever believes that he can help Britain must realize one thing above all: Every ship, with or without convoy, that comes within range of our torpedo tubes, will be torpedoed.

We have been drawn into war against our will. No man can offer his hand more often than I have. But if they want to fight to exterminate the German nation, then they will get the surprise of their lives. This time they will not meet a worn-out Germany, as in the Great War. They will encounter a Germany mobilized in the highest sense of the word, capable of fighting and determined to fight. If there are hopes to the contrary, I do not understand them.

They say Italy will drop out. It would be better for these gentle-

men not to invent revolutions in Milan but to guard against outbreaks in their own countries. They regard relations between Germany and Italy in the same way as they are accustomed to behave towards their own friends. When one of the democracies helps another it always asks for something in exchange, such as bases. And these bases are promptly occupied. (Berlin, Jan. 30, 1941; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Feb. 1, 1941)

Threats and Counter-threats

If today new threats, particularly from America, are directed against Germany, they too have received my timely attention. Already more than a year ago I declared that regardless of what ship carries war materials, that is, materials for killing men, it will be torpedoed. If now the American President Roosevelt, who was once responsible for Poland's entry into the war and who, as we today can definitely prove, persuaded France to enter the war, believes that he can intimidate us by his order to shoot, then there is only one answer I can give this gentleman.

President Roosevelt has ordered his ships to shoot the moment they sight German ships. I have ordered German ships not to shoot when they sight American vessels but to defend themselves as soon as attacked. I will have any German officer courtmartialled who fails to defend himself. If, therefore, an American ship shoots according to the President's order, it will do so at its own risk. The German ship will defend itself, and our torpedoes will find their mark. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1941; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 9, 1941)

Washington Versus Berlin

I am of the conviction that this continent will not be the second continent of the world, but that it will remain hereafter as before, the first continent of the world. And if Mr. Willkie, this man of honor, declares that there are only two possibilities: Either Berlin will be the capital of the world, or Washington, then I can only say that Berlin does not even want to be the world's capital and Washington will never become the world's capital. There would even be a half a hundred middle-sized cities in Europe, so I believe, that would protest against such a cultural affliction of humanity. (Munich, Nov. 8, 1941; *Voelkischer Beobachter*, Nov. 9, 1941)

Injured Innocence

Insofar as Germany's relation to America is concerned, the following may be said. Germany is perhaps the only great power which never possessed a colony or otherwise engaged in political activity either in the North American or the South American continent, apart from the fact that through the immigration of many millions of Germans and through their contributions the American continent and especially the United States derived benefits therefrom. The German Government has never, during the entire history of the origin and existence of the United States, adopted from the political standpoint, an antagonistic or hostile attitude toward the United States. In fact, Germany helped the United States with the blood of many of her sons.

The German Reich never participated in any war against the United States, but the United States waged war against Germany in 1917. Apart from this there were no differences between the American people and the German people. The difference between the respective forms of government was always present. This could not, however, be considered a reason for hostilities in international relations, so long as one state did not presume to go beyond its own natural limits and interfere in the affairs of others. Between the two states lies an ocean. The differences between capitalist America and Bolshevik Russia must be essentially greater, that is, if these two concepts have any truth in them, than between America led by a President and Germany led by a *Fuehrer*. It is, however, a fact that the two historic conflicts between Germany and the United States, even though inspired by the same motive, were instigated entirely by two men of the United States, namely, President Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. (Berlin, Dec. 11, 1941; *Neue Zuercher Zeitung*, Dec. 12, 1941)

The Chief Culprit of the War

And now permit me to define my attitude to that other world, which has its representative in that man, who, while our soldiers are fighting in snow and ice, very tactfully likes to make his chats from the fireside, the man who is the main culprit of this war. . . . When in August [1939] the attitude of Poland—thanks to the *carte blanche* guarantee received from England—became still stiffer, the government of the Reich found it necessary to submit, for the last time, a proposal on the basis of which we were willing to enter into negotiations with Poland—negotiations of which we fully and completely ap-

prised the then British Ambassador. . . . The Polish Government at that period refused as much as to consider this proposal. The question then arises: How could such an unimportant state dare simply to refuse an offer of this nature and, furthermore, not only indulge in further atrocities to its German inhabitants who had given that country the whole of its culture but even order mobilization? Perusal of documents of the Foreign Office in Warsaw has given us later some surprising explanations. There was one man who, with devilish lack of conscience, used all his influence to further the warlike intentions of Poland and to eliminate all possibilities of understanding. The reports which the then Polish Ambassador in Washington, Count Potocki, sent to his government are documents from which it may be seen with terrifying clearness to what an extent one man alone and the forces driving him are responsible for the second World War. The question next arises, how could this man fall into such enmity towards a country, which in the whole of its history has never done the least harm either to America or to him personally? . . .

Why is there now another President of the United States [the other President Hitler has in mind is Wilson] who regards it as his only task to intensify anti-German feeling to the pitch of war? National Socialism came to power in Germany in the same year as Roosevelt was elected President. I understand only too well that a world-wide distance separates Roosevelt's ideas and my ideas. Roosevelt comes from a rich family and belongs to the class whose path is smoothed in the democracies. I was only the child of a small, poor family and had to fight my way by work and industry. When the Great War came, Roosevelt occupied a position where he got to know only its pleasant consequences, enjoyed by those who do business while others bleed. I was only one of those who carried out orders, as an ordinary soldier, and naturally returned from the war just as poor as I was in the autumn of 1914. I shared the fate of millions, and Franklin Roosevelt only the fate of the so-called upper ten thousand.

After the war, Roosevelt tried his hand at financial speculations. He made profits out of the inflation, out of the misery of others, while I, together with many hundreds of thousands more, lay in a hospital. When Roosevelt finally stepped on the political stage with all the advantages of his class, I was unknown and fought for the resurrection of my people. When Roosevelt took his place at the head of the United States, he was the candidate of a capitalist party which made use of him. When I became Chancellor of the German Reich, I was the *Fuehrer* of the popular Movement I had created. The powers behind

Roosevelt were those powers I had fought at home. The Brain Trust was composed of people such as we have fought against in Germany as parasites and have removed from public life.

Yet there is something in common between us. Roosevelt took over a state in a very poor economic condition, and I took over a Reich faced with complete ruin, also thanks to democracy. In the United States there were 13,000,000 unemployed, and in Germany 7,000,000 and another 7,000,000 part-time workers. The finances of both states were in a bad way and ordinary economic life could scarcely be maintained. A development then started in the United States and in the German Reich which will make it easy for posterity to pass a verdict on the correctness of the theories.

While an unprecedented revival of economic life, culture, and art took place in Germany under National Socialist leadership within the space of a few years, President Roosevelt did not succeed in bringing about even the slightest improvement in his own country. Yet this work must have been much easier in the United States, where there live scarcely fifteen persons on a square kilometer, as against 140 in Germany. If such a country does not succeed in assuring economic prosperity, this must be a result either of the bad faith of its leaders in power or of a total inefficiency on the part of the leading men. In scarcely five years, economic problems had been solved in Germany and unemployment had been overcome. During the same period, President Roosevelt had increased the state debt of his country to an enormous extent, had decreased the value of the dollar, and had brought about a further disintegration of economic life without diminishing the unemployment figures. All this is not surprising if one bears in mind that the men he had called to support him, or rather, the men who had called him, belonged to the Jewish element, whose interests are all for disintegration and never for order. While speculation was being fought in National Socialist Germany, it thrived astoundingly under the Roosevelt regime.

Roosevelt's New Deal legislation was all wrong; it was actually the biggest failure ever experienced by one man. There can be no doubt that a continuation of this economic policy would have undone this President in peace time, in spite of all his dialectical skill. In a European state, he would surely have come eventually before a state court on a charge of deliberate waste of the national wealth; and he would have scarcely escaped at the hand of a civil court on a charge of criminal business methods.

This fact was realized and fully appreciated also by many Ameri-

caus, including some of high standing. A threatening opposition was gathering over the head of this man. He guessed that the only salvation for him lay in diverting public attention from home to foreign policy. It is interesting to study in this connection the reports of the Polish envoy in Washington, Potocki. He repeatedly points out that Roosevelt was fully aware of the danger threatening the card castle of his economic system with collapse, and that he was therefore urgently in need of a diversion in foreign policy. He was strengthened in this resolve by the Jews around him. Their Old Testament thirst for revenge thought to see in the United States an instrument for preparing a second *Purim* for the European nations which were becoming increasingly anti-Semitic. The full diabolical meanness of Jewry rallied around this man, and he stretched out his hands.

Thus began the increasing efforts of the American President to create conflicts, to do everything to prevent conflicts from being peacefully solved. For years this man harbored one desire—that a conflict should break out somewhere in the world. The most convenient place would be in Europe, where American economy would be committed to the cause of one of the belligerents in such a way that a political interconnection of interests would arise calculated slowly to bring America nearer to such a conflict. This would thereby divert public interest from bankrupt economic policy at home towards foreign problems.

His attitude toward the German Reich . . . was particularly sharp. In 1937 Roosevelt made a number of speeches, including a particularly mean one delivered in Chicago on October 5th, 1937. Systematically he began to incite American public opinion against Germany. He threatened to establish a kind of quarantine against the so-called authoritarian states. While making these increasingly spiteful and inflammatory speeches, President Roosevelt summoned the American Ambassadors to Washington to report to him. This event followed some further declarations of an insulting character; and ever since, the two countries [America and Germany] have been connected with each other only through *Chargés d'Affaires*.

From November 1938 onwards, his systematic efforts were directed towards sabotaging any possibility of an appeasement policy in Europe. In public, he was hypocritically pretending to be for peace; but at the same time he was threatening any country ready to pursue a peaceful understanding with the freezing of assets, with economic reprisals, with demands for the repayment of loans, and the like. Stag-

gering information to this effect can be derived from the reports of Polish Ambassadors in Washington, London, Paris, and Brussels.

In January, 1939, this man began to strengthen his campaign of incitement and threatened to take all possible Congressional measures against the authoritarian states, with the exception of war; while alleging that other countries were trying to interfere in American affairs, and insisting on the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, he himself began from March 1939 onwards to meddle in European affairs which were no concern at all of the President of the United States, since he does not understand those problems, and even if he did understand them and the historic background behind them, he would have just as little right to worry about the Central European area as the German Reich has to judge conditions in the United States and to take an attitude towards them.

Mr. Roosevelt went even further. In contradiction to all the tenets of international law, he declared that he would not recognize certain governments which did not suit him, would not accept readjustments, would maintain legations of states dissolved long before, or would actually set them up as legal governments. He even went so far as to conclude agreements with such envoys and thus to acquire a right simply to occupy foreign territories. On April 15, 1939, came Roosevelt's famous appeal to myself and the Duce. It was a clumsy combination of geographical and political ignorance and of the arrogance of the millionaire circles around him. It asked us to give undertakings to conclude non-aggression pacts indiscriminately with any country, including mostly countries which were not even free, since Mr. Roosevelt's allies had annexed them or changed them into protectorates. You will remember, my deputies, that I then gave a polite and clear reply to this honest warmonger. . . .

After a little rest [Roosevelt] came back on the scene and on November 4, 1939, engineered the revision of the Neutrality Law so as to suspend the ban on the export of arms, in favor of a one-sided delivery of arms to Germany's opponents. He then begins, somewhat as in Asia and in China by the round-about way of an economic infiltration, to establish a community of interests destined to become operative sooner or later. In the same month, he recognizes, as a so-called government in exile, a gang of Polish emigrants whose only political foundation was a few million gold coins taken with them from Warsaw. On April 9th, he goes on and orders the blocking of Norwegian and Danish assets under the lying pretext of placing them beyond German reach, although he knows perfectly well that the Danish Gov-

ernment in its financial administration is not in any way being interfered with, let alone controlled, by Germany. To the various exiled governments recognized by him, the Norwegian Government is now added. On May 15, 1940, he recognizes the Dutch and Belgian Émigrés Governments. This is followed by blocking Dutch and Belgian assets. His true mentality then comes clearly to light in a telegram of June 15th, to the French Prime Minister, Reynaud. He advises him that the American Government will double its help to France, provided that France continues the war against Germany. To give still greater expression to his wish for a continuation of the war, he issues a declaration that the American Government will not recognize the results of the conquest of territories—i. e., the restoration to Germany of lands which had been stolen from her. I do not need to assure you, members of the Reichstag, that it is a matter of complete indifference to every German Government whether the President of the United States recognizes the frontiers of Europe or not and that this indifference will likewise continue in the future. I merely quote this to illustrate the methodical incitement which has come from this man who speaks hypocritically of peace but always urges war.

But now he is seized with fear that if peace is brought about in Europe, his squandering of millions of money on armaments will be looked upon as plain fraud, since nobody will attack America—and he then himself must provoke this attack upon his country. On July 17, 1940, the American President orders the blocking of French assets with a view, as he puts it, to placing them beyond German reach, but really in order to transfer the French gold from Casablanca to America with the assistance of an American cruiser. In July 1940 he tries by enlisting American citizens in the British Air Force and by training British airmen in the United States to pave ever better the way to war. In August 1940 a military program is jointly drawn up between the United States and Canada. To make the establishment of a Canadian-United States Defense Committee plausible—plausible at least to the biggest fools—he invents from time to time crises by means of which he pretends that America is being threatened by aggression. This he wishes to impress upon the American people by suddenly returning on April 3rd to Washington with all speed on account of the alleged danger of the situation. In September 1940 he draws still nearer to the war. He turns over to the British fleet fifty destroyers of the American Navy in return for which, to be sure, he takes over several British bases in North and South America.

From these actions it may be clearly seen how, with all his hatred

for socialist Germany, he forms the resolution of taking over, as safely and securely as possible, the British Empire in the moment of its downfall. Since England is no longer in the position to pay cash for all the American deliveries, he imposes the Lease-Lend Law on the American people. He thus receives powers to lend or lease support to countries, the defense of which may appear to him as vital to America's interest. Then in 1941, as Germany cannot be made to react to any of his gestures, he takes yet a further step. As far back as December 9, 1939, American cruisers in the security zone handed over the German ship *Columbus* to the British. In the circumstances she had to be sunk [note: i. e., scuttled]. On the same day, United States forces cooperated to prevent the attempted escape of the German steamer *Arauca*. On January 27, 1940, the United States cruiser *Trenton* in contravention of international law advised enemy naval forces of the movements of the German steamers *Arauca*, *La Plata*, and *Mangoni*. On June 27, 1940, he ordered, in complete contravention of international law, a restriction of the freedom of movement of foreign ships in United States harbors. In November, 1940, he ordered the German ships *Phrygia*, *Idarwald* and *Rhein* to be shadowed by American ships until these steamers were compelled to scuttle themselves so as not to fall into enemy hands. On April 30, 1941, there followed the opening up of the Red Sea to United States ships, so that they could carry supplies to the British armies in the Near East. Meanwhile in March all German ships were requisitioned by the American authorities.

In the course of this, German nationals were treated in a most inhuman manner, and in contravention of all notions of international law, certain places of residence were assigned them, traveling restrictions imposed upon them, and so on. Two German officers, who had escaped from Canadian captivity were—again, contrary to all the dictates of international law—handcuffed and handed over to the Canadian authorities. On March 24th, the same President who stands against every aggression, acclaimed Simovitch and his companions who gained their positions by aggression and by removing the lawful government of the country. Roosevelt some months before sent Colonel Donovan, a completely unworthy creature, to the Balkans, to Sofia and Belgrade, to engineer a rising against Germany and Italy.

In April, he promised help to Yugoslavia and Greece under the Lease-Lend Act. At the end of April, this man recognized the Yugoslav and Greek Émigrés Governments and, once more against international law, blocked the Yugoslav and Greek assets. From the middle

of April onwards, American watch over the Western Atlantic by United States patrols was extended, and reports were made to the British. On April 26th, Roosevelt transferred to the British twenty motor-torpedo boats, and at the same time British warships were being repaired in United States ports. On May 5th, the illegal arming and repairing of Norwegian ships for England took place. On June 4th, American troop transports arrived in Greenland, to build airdromes. On June 9th, came the first British report that, on Roosevelt's orders, a United States warship had attacked a German U-boat with depth charges near Greenland. On June 4th, German assets in the United States were illegally blocked. On June 7th, Roosevelt demanded under mendacious pretexts that German consuls should be withdrawn and German consulates closed. He also demanded the closing of the German Press Agency, Transocean, the German Information Library, and the German Reichsbank Central Office. On July 6th and 7th, Iceland, which is within the German fighting-zone, was occupied by American forces on the orders of Roosevelt. He intended, first of all, to force Germany to make war and to make the German U-boat warfare as ineffective as it was in 1915-16. At the same time, he promised American help to the Soviet Union. On June 10th, the Navy Minister, Knox, suddenly announced an American order to shoot at Axis warships. On September 4th, the United States destroyer *Greer*, obeying orders, operated with British aircraft against German U-boats in the Atlantic. Five days later, a German U-boat noticed the United States destroyer acting as escort in a British convoy. On September 11th, Roosevelt finally made a speech in which he confirmed and repeated his order to fire on all Axis ships. On September 29th, United States escort-vessels attacked a German U-boat with depth charges east of Greenland. On October 7th, the United States destroyer *Kearney*, acting as an escort-vessel for Britain, again attacked a German U-boat with depth charges. Finally, on November 6th, United States forces illegally seized the German steamer, *Odenwald*, and took it to an American port where the crew was taken prisoner.

I will pass over the insulting attacks made by this so-called President against me. That he calls me a gangster is uninteresting. After all, this expression was not coined in Europe but in America, no doubt because such gangsters are lacking here. Apart from this, I cannot be insulted by Roosevelt, for I consider him mad, just as Wilson was. I do not need to mention what this man has done for years in the same way against Japan. First he incites war, then falsifies the causes, then odiously wraps himself in a cloak of Christian hypocrisy and slowly

but surely leads mankind to war, not without calling God to witness the honesty of his attack—in the approved manner of an old Freemason. I think you have all found it a relief that now, at last, one state has been the first to take the step of protesting against this historically unique and shameless ill-treatment of truth, and of right—which protest this man has desired and about which he cannot complain. The fact that the Japanese Government, which has been negotiating for years with this man, has at last become tired of being mocked by him, in such an unworthy way, fills us all, the German people and, I think, all other decent people in the world, with deep satisfaction. We have seen what the Jews have done in Soviet Russia. We have made the acquaintance of the Jewish paradise on earth. Millions of German soldiers have been able to see this country where the international Jews have destroyed people and property. The President of the United States ought finally to understand—I say this only because of his limited intellect—that we know that the aim of this struggle is to destroy one state after another. But the present German Reich has nothing more in common with the old Germany. And we, for our part, will now do what this *provocateur* has been trying to do so much for years. Not only because we are the ally of Japan but also because Germany and Italy have enough insight and strength to comprehend that, in these historic times, the existence or non-existence of the nations is being decided perhaps forever. We clearly see the intentions of the rest of the world toward us. They reduced democratic Germany to hunger. They would exterminate our social order of today. . . .

As for the German nation, it needs charity neither from Mr. Roosevelt nor from Mr. Churchill, let alone from Mr. Eden. It wants only its rights! It will secure for itself this right to life even if thousands of Churchills and Roosevelts conspire against it. In the whole history of the German nation, of nearly 2,000 years, it has never been so united as today and, thanks to National Socialism, it will remain united in the future. Probably it has never seen so clearly and rarely been so conscious of its honor. I have therefore arranged for his passports to be handed to the American *Chargé d’Affaires* today, and the following . . . [drowned in long applause]

As a consequence of the further extension of President Roosevelt’s policy, which is aimed at unrestricted world domination and dictatorship, the United States together with England have not hesitated from using any means to dispute the rights of the German, Italian, and Japanese nations to the basis of their natural existence. The govern-

ments of the United States and of England have therefore resisted, not only now but also for all time, every just understanding meant to bring about a better new order in the world. Since the beginning of the war the American President, Roosevelt, has been guilty of a series of the worst crimes against international law; illegal seizure of ships and other property of German and Italian nationals were coupled with the threat to, and looting of, those who were deprived of their liberty by being interned. Roosevelt's ever-increasing attacks finally went so far that he ordered the American Navy to attack everywhere ships under the German and Italian flags, and to sink them—this in gross violation of international law. American Ministers boasted of having destroyed German submarines in this criminal way. German and Italian merchant ships were attacked by American cruisers, captured, and their crews imprisoned. With no attempt at an official denial there has now been revealed in America, President Roosevelt's plan by which, at the latest in 1943, Germany and Italy were to be attacked in Europe by military means. In this way the sincere efforts of Germany and Italy to prevent an extension of the war and to maintain relations with the United States in spite of the unbearable provocations which have been carried on for years by President Roosevelt, have been frustrated. Germany and Italy have been finally compelled, in view of this, and in loyalty to the Tripartite Pact,* to carry on the struggle against the United States and England jointly and side by side with Japan for the defense, and thus for the maintenance, of the liberty and independence of their nations and empires.

The Three Powers have therefore concluded the following agreement, which was signed in Berlin today:

"In their unshakable determination not to lay down arms until the joint war against the United States and England reaches a successful conclusion, the German, Italian and Japanese Governments have agreed on the following points:

"Article 1. Germany, Italy and Japan will wage the common war forced upon them by the United States and England with all the means of power at their disposal, to a victorious conclusion.

"Article 2. Germany, Italy and Japan undertake not to conclude an armistice or peace with the United States or with England without complete mutual understanding.

"Article 3. Germany, Italy and Japan will continue the closest cooperation even after the victorious conclusion of the war in order to

*The Tripartite Pact was signed in Berlin on Sept. 27, 1940.

bring about a just new order in the sense of the Tripartite Pact concluded by them on September 27, 1940.

"Article 4. This agreement comes into force immediately after signature and remains in force as long as the Tripartite Pact of September 27, 1940. The Signatory Powers will confer in time, before this period ends, about the future form of the cooperation provided for in Article 3 of this agreement." (Berlin, Dec. 11, 1941; B.B.C.)

Jews Over America

A clique of Jews who went to the United States dragged that country into war against all its interests only for Jewish-capitalist reasons. President Roosevelt, owing to his own lack of ability, seeks advice from a Brain Trust whose leading men are all Jews. Just as in 1917, the United States was dragged step by step into war by her Judaized President and his Jewish entourage—a war without any reason, against nations who had never harmed the United States, against peoples from whom the United States could never gain anything. What is the point of a war by a state with space without people against a people without space? From a political point of view, this war is not being waged in the interests of individual people. It is a clash between nations who want to secure a safe existence for their people and nations who have become the powerless tools of international parasites. (Berlin, April 26, 1942; B.B.C.)

20

Visions of Defeat

“One thing will turn out to be certain: Germany will never capitulate.”

Danzig, September 19, 1939

“Neither military force, economic pressure, nor the time factor will ever force Germany to surrender.”

Berlin, December 10, 1940

Hitler's speech of September 10, 1943, was his most unimpressive performance since his rise to power. This was not the Fuehrer of old. The booming confidence, the defiant threats, the proud recital of German victories, the dynamic delivery—these were gone. It was a short, tame address by a tired, unconvincing Hitler. The truth is, he was forced to speak. Since November, 1942, he had remained virtually silent. And for good reason. Russian victories, the loss of Africa, and the heavy bombings of the Reich made poor speech material. But Italy's unconditional surrender was a different story. That event had irreparably shattered the Rome-Berlin Axis. The logic of events compelled the Fuehrer to explain the situation.

His explanation was weak. In a great display of moral indignation, he told of the "betrayal" of noble Germany by the villainous Italians. Allied strategy and superiority had nothing to do with Italy's defection. It was Italian treason—the "stab-in-the-back" again. An old farcical face-saving device was back in use. As for Mussolini, he may have been flattered by Hitler's fulsome praise, but he could scarcely have appreciated other implications in the Fuehrer's address. In the final analysis, the Duce appeared a weak and pathetic failure.

As far as the Volk was concerned, Hitler had little to offer. His whole approach was now defensive. His emphasis was on the ring of steel protecting Germany—not on her striking power. To the defeatists and slackers, he repeated the old story that the loss of the war would mean Germany's destruction. Finally, he implored the Volk not to forsake the Nazi cause and to have faith in the ultimate triumph of German arms. But it was not a prospect of victory he held forth; it was a vision of defeat.

Farewell to the Axis

Freed from the heavy burden of expectation weighing on us for a long time, I now consider that the moment has come again to address myself to the German people without having to resort to lies, either to myself or to the public.

The collapse of Italy, which has now taken place, was an event that could have been anticipated for a long time. This collapse was not due to a lack of suitable facilities for Italy's defending herself effectively or to the fact that requisite German aid did not materialize. Rather was it due to the failure, or rather to the unwillingness, of those elements who, to crown their systematic sabotage, have now caused the capitulation. What these men had been aspiring to for years has now been achieved. The Italian leaders of state have gone over from the German Reich, ally of Italy, to the common enemy. When in September, 1939, England and France declared war on the Reich, Italy would have been bound by treaties immediately to declare her solidarity with Germany. This solidarity was not only founded in the agreements, but was also expedient because of the fate our enemies had planned both for Germany and Italy. It is known that Mussolini was firmly resolved to order immediate mobilization in Italy in accordance with the treaties. In August, 1939, the very same forces that today brought about capitulation, succeeded in preventing Italy from entering the war.

As *Fuehrer* of the German nation I had to understand these extraordinary internal difficulties of the Duce. Therefore, I did not press Italy then or later to fulfill her treaty obligations. On the contrary, I left it entirely to the Italian Government either not to enter the war at all or, if they entered, to do so at a time that was convenient to the Italian Government and that the latter could determine freely.

In June, 1940, Mussolini had succeeded in attaining the internal prerequisites for Italy's entry into the war at the side of the Reich. At that time the struggle in Poland had been decided, as had that in Norway and that against France and her Allied English armies on the Continent. Nevertheless, I had to be grateful to the Duce for his attitude, which—as I knew—he had been able to assert in Italy only with greatest difficulty, not in opposition to the Italian people but against certain circles. Since that time the Reich and Italy have stood side by side in battle in many theaters of war and both our nations

have shed their blood together. Not for a second did the Duce or I doubt that the outcome of this struggle was to decide on life or death for our nations. Consequently Germany, herself locked in grim battle, gave aid to her ally to the limit of what was possible. Many offers of help were from the outset either completely rejected by the military rulers of Italy or else were accepted only under conditions that it was impossible to fulfill. At the appropriate time the public will see documents that make evident what contribution Germany made to her ally during the fateful common struggle and was still prepared to make.

In the common theaters of war the German soldier displayed that attitude which distinguishes him everywhere, for without his intervention North Africa would have been lost to Italy as long ago as the winter of 1940-41. The name of Marshal Rommel will always be associated with this German achievement. When the Reich decided in the spring of 1941 to help Italy in the Balkans this was not done to achieve personal aims but to assist an ally and to remove dangers that had been caused by that ally and that, of course, also threatened Germany. Germany made these sacrifices at a moment when she had almost more than enough of her own worries to bear, fearing a large-scale Bolshevik attack against the whole of Europe almost hourly. The blood of many of our compatriots sealed the German people's loyalty to its engagements. The German Reich, and I as its *Fuehrer*, could only adopt this attitude because it was known that one of the most outstanding men of modern times was at the head of Italy, the greatest son of Italian soil since the collapse of the ancient empire. His bearing was so loyal that conditions existed for success of the common alliance. His fall and the disgraceful insults to which he was subjected will be felt with the deepest shame by future generations of the Italian people.

The last and decisive factor in the *coup d'état* was the Duce's demand for increased powers for successful prosecution of the war, for the most stringent measures against open and concealed saboteurs of the war effort, against reactionary enemies of social justice and against people undermining the powers of resistance of the Italian public. In the very last minute Mussolini desired to eliminate the cunning enemies of the Italian people in the life-or-death struggle and thereby secure Italy's future. I personally was seized with understandable sorrow at the unique historic injustice inflicted on this man, at the shameful

treatment meted out to a man who for twenty years lived only for his people and who is now treated as a common criminal. I was and still am happy to describe this great and loyal man as my friend. Furthermore, I have not learned to change my views from time to time according to circumstances, or merely to deny them. I believe that, despite some opposite views, loyalty has an irreplaceable value in the life of peoples, just as it has in the lives of individuals, a value without which human society would totter and its organization sooner or later collapse.

Despite this action, German troops, airmen, U-boat crews, speed-boat crews and so on, continued to do their duty on land, in the air and at sea, to the utmost. For practical reasons the enemy may deny this today, but future generations will find that with the exception of a few brave Italian formations, only German troops defended not merely the German Reich, but Italian soil, with their blood, during this time. If Italian leaders have decided to break the alliance and to cease being a belligerent, thus making Italy more than ever a theater of war, they can ascribe this decision to whatever reasons they like. They can represent this as necessary, but they will never find an excuse for the fact that this took place without at least informing their ally in advance. On the same day on which Marshal Badoglio agreed to and signed the armistice he gave assurance to the German chargé d'affaires that he, Marshal Badoglio, would never betray Germany, that we must have confidence in him and that he would prove by his deeds that he was worthy of this confidence and that Italy never intended to capitulate. Even after the capitulation the King specially assured the German chargé d'affaires that Italy would never capitulate and that she was linked with Germany for better or for worse and that she would stand at Germany's side.

Yes, an hour after the announcement of the betrayal, Italian Chief of Staff Roatta declared this news to be a base lie and British propaganda to the German plenipotentiary. At the same moment a representative of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated this news was a typical British lie that he intended to deny, to admit only fifteen minutes later that, of course, this news was right, and Italy in fact had left the war. This may be regarded by the democratic war criminals and by the Italian leaders of today as a skillful tactical maneuver of statecraft. History will judge differently and generations of Italians will be ashamed that these tactics were employed against an ally who

had fulfilled her treaty to the hilt with blood and sacrifices. My compatriots, having had more than sufficient opportunity for more than two years of watching the increasing influence of reactionary anti-German circles in Italy who rejected the social tasks set for Italy, hardly any doubt was possible after the Duce had been overthrown as to the true intentions behind this change of government. As was my duty, I therefore ordered all measures taken for such contingency to protect the German Reich from the fate that Marshal Badoglio and his men not only inflicted on the Duce and his men but into which they also intended to drag Germany.

The interests of the German nation's war are as holy to us as they are compelling. We all know that, in this merciless fight, according to the intentions of our enemies, the vanquished will be destroyed to afford the victor the possibility of living. We therefore intend, with the greatest determination, always to take such measures in small and big matters that are designed to frustrate the intentions of our enemies. Also numerous Italians who love honor have declared themselves indissolubly linked with us in this fight of the two nations. The withdrawal of Italy means little in a military sense because the struggle in that country has for months been sustained and carried on mainly by German forces. We will now continue the struggle free of all burdensome encumbrances. The attempt of international plutocratic plotters to talk away German resistance in Italy is childish. In this case they are mixing the German nation with another nation. Hope of finding traitors here rests on complete ignorance of the character of the National Socialist State; a belief that they can bring about a July 25th in Germany rests on a fundamental illusion as to my personal position as well as about the attitude of my political collaborators and my field marshals, admirals and generals. More than ever before the German leadership opposes these intentions as a fanatical unit. Any emergency will only fortify us in our determination. Personal life for myself has in any case long ceased to exist. I work from recognition and a sense of duty to make my contribution in safeguarding the life of my nation for future generations. My right to believe unconditionally in success is founded not only on my own life but also on the destiny of our people.

In 1939 we had to face the declarations of war of our enemies alone and in isolation. We acted according to the tenets of a faith that teaches that heroic resistance is better under any circumstances

than cowardly submission. Therefore, I declared as early as September 1, 1939, in my speech to the Reichstag, that neither time nor force of arms would ever bring the German people down. Since then the enemy, mainly through our own power, has been driven back more than 1,000 kilometers from the German borders. Only from the air is he able to terrorize the German homeland, but in this respect also technical and administrative conditions for finally breaking his terroristic attacks are coming into existence, as well as those for retaliation by other and more efficient means. Tactical necessity may compel us once and again to give up something on some front in this gigantic fateful struggle, and to avoid some particular threat, but it will never break the ring of steel that, forged by the homeland and maintained through the heroism of our front, protects the German Reich. However, we expect that in just such times the nation will fulfill its duty defiantly and with dogged determination in all spheres. It has every reason to have confidence in itself, but the party must be a model in every respect.

The home front can look with pride upon its soldiers who, with heroic sacrifice of their blood, do their duty over and over again under most difficult conditions. The front, however, in painful hours under often superhuman burdens lasting throughout weeks and months, may remember the homeland, which today has also become a fighting front, where the iron heroism of old men, boys, mothers, women, and girls finds its fulfillment. Every soldier, therefore, has the sacred duty of maintaining the greatest steadfastness even more than those and to do whatever is demanded by the struggle. Never in its whole history had the German people a better right to be proud of itself than in this greatest struggle of all times. This determination and this achievement will defeat all attempts to impose the lot of a slave nation on the German people as well. May every German be steadfastly and consciously aware that his effort and his readiness for sacrifice is responsible for the attitude of our people and for the fate and future of many generations. Therefore I cannot thank with words the German people—men and women of the home front and soldiers at the front—for all they do and for all they willingly bear and patiently suffer. Future generations will one day express this gratitude in the knowledge that here a free and socially secure life has been won by the greatest sacrifices. I am proud myself that I can be the leader of this nation and I am grateful to God for every hour that

he grants me so that through my work I can carry through the greatest struggle of our history to success.

The measures decreed for the protection of German interests in the face of events in Italy are very hard. Insofar as they affect Italy they are being applied according to plan and already with good results. The example of Yugoslavia's betrayal had given us in advance a salutary lesson and valuable experience. The fate of Italy herself, however, may serve as a lesson to us all never, in the hours of gravest crisis and most dire distress, to forsake the commandment of national honor but to stand loyally by our allies and our hearts, full of faith, to do what duty demands. To a people that passes successfully through these trials ordained by Providence the Almighty will give in the end the laurel wreath of victory and, thus, the prize of life. Come what may, this people must and will be Germany. (Berlin, Sept. 10, 1943; F.C.C.)

Index

- Achievement**, 6, 7, 12, 123, 128, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 151, 153, 155, 156, 157, 164, 195, 214, 233, 255, 256, 294; leaders of, 123.
- Achilles heel**, 223.
- Acropolis**, 139, 144.
- Africa**, 272, 278, 296, 353.
- Aggrandizement**, 28, 318.
- Aggression**, 29, 353, 360, 372, 373.
- Agriculture**, 207; English, 25.
- Albania**, 292.
- Alliances**, 58, 64, 65, 112, 233, 235, 279, 293; with the devil, 61-62; with Italy, 64, 277-296.
- Allied Powers**, 65, 241, 242; Entente of, 65.
- Allies**, 134, 241, 242, 245, 252, 269, 278, 279, 280, 281, 294, 295, 340, 356, 371, 375.
- Alps**, 288, 295.
- Alsace-Lorraine**, 60, 61, 191, 193, 194, 279, 281.
- America (United States)**, 48, 77, 229, 247, 277, 284, 296, 319, 320, 328, 329, 334, 337, 339, 341-377; and World War I, 343-4.
- America, Central and South**, 349, 358.
- American Continent**, 349, 356, 358, 361, 365, 367.
- Anarchy**, 44, 45, 149, 151; intellectual causes of, 44-45.
- Anglo-German friendship**, 187; naval accord, 301, 304, 306.
- Anglo-Saxon**, 43, 188, 240, 270.
- Annihilation**, 18, 57, 58, 74, 82, 175, 214, 265, 270, 272.
- Anschluss**, 185, 245, 287.
- Anti-capitalism**, 51.
- Anti-Comintern agreement**, 285, 289.
- Anti-Semitism**, 71, 78, 83, 370.
- Arabia (Arabs)**, 227, 303, 310, 320, 359, 360.
- Arauca**, 373.
- Armaments**, 49, 116, 154, 172, 173, 174, 187, 222, 230, 243, 291, 305, 306, 326, 332, 333, 346, 347, 361, 372.
- Armistice**, 236, 242, 247, 376.
- Army**, 10, 11, 55, 60, 90, 91, 95, 98, 103, 116, 118, 195, 204, 215, 219, 224, 228, 258, 259, 269, 291, 317, 361, 373; of unemployed, 201, 202, 203, 204, 210; of world revolution, 210; people's army, 75.
- Arras**, 219.
- Art**, 5, 13, 63, 75, 76, 137-157, 290, 310, 311, 369; and politics, 141-143; degenerate art, 151; National Socialist art, 147-151; art of governing, 338, 339, 340.
- Aryan**, 5, 6, 8, 71, 75, 77, 83, 155; *Weltanschauung*, 77.
- Asia**, 253, 273, 284, 285, 286, 319, 371.
- Assurances**, 22, 179-195, 213, 223, 224, 233, 240, 243, 289, 305, 324, 356, 360.
- Atheism**, 88.
- Athens**, 139, 144.
- Atlantic patrols**, 374.
- Attila**, 251.
- Austria (East Mark, Ostmark)**, 17, 94, 176, 184, 238, 240, 241, 242, 245, 280, 287, 310.
- Authoritarianism**, 46.
- Authoritarian state**, 126, 299, 370, 371.
- Authority**, 39, 44, 107, 142, 148, 149, 153, 214, 220, 243, 351, 354, 378; of leader, 39, 41; of leadership, 42; principle of, 44.
- Axis**, 277-296, 374.
- Bach, Joh. Sebastian**, 345.
- Balance of power**, 57, 223, 314, 315, 318, 319, 320.
- Balbo, Marshal**, 295.
- Balkans**, 316, 373.
- Balkanization: of Europe**, 57; of Germany, 57, 64.
- Baltic States**, 185; non-aggression pacts with, 185.
- Banat**, 279.
- Bastardization**, 40, 41, 73, 79.
- Bauer, Professor**, 251.
- Bauernpolitik (agrarian policy)**, 24.
- Bauernstaat (state based upon the peasantry)**, 27.

- Bavaria**, 56, 251.
Bavarian: People's Party, 88, 251;
 tourist trade, 139; **Government**, 251.
Bayerischer Kurier, 281.
Beethoven, 5, 40, 311, 345.
Belgium, 186, 359; émigré government,
 372.
Belgrade, 373.
Benes, Dr. Eduard, 51, 114, 115, 239,
 240.
Berchtesgaden, 241, 242.
Berlin, 151, 153, 177, 215, 251, 252,
 264, 266, 279, 282, 285, 288, 376; in
 1914, 69; versus Washington, 366.
Bethmann-Hollweg, 307.
Bible, 89.
Bismarck, 6, 10, 37, 58, 254, 280, 319;
 and Italy, 62, 64.
Blackshirts, 289.
Blockade, 244, 316.
Blood, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27,
 28, 40, 41, 45, 58, 60, 71, 72, 73, 75,
 78, 79, 80, 81, 87, 94, 122, 123, 125,
 129, 134, 149, 155, 165, 176, 181, 209,
 258, 259, 271, 281, 294, 314, 318, 319,
 320, 326, 334, 335, 367; *see also* race.
Bloodshed, 17, 33, 94, 260, 337, 351,
 353, 364.
Bodenpolitik (policy of the soil), 24.
Bodenwirtschaft (agricultural econo-
 my), 24-25.
Bohemia, 279.
Bolshevik, 50, 83, 84, 88, 150, 210, 254,
 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263, 264, 270,
 271, 272, 284, 286, 292, 340, 367.
Bolshevism, 46, 83-84, 88, 89, 153, 202-
 203, 230, 249-273, 285, 286, 289, 290,
 345, 346; ally of democracy, 50-51.
Bolshevization, 82, 289.
Bourgeois, 3, 70, 77, 116, 123, 153, 165,
 228, 251, 278, 291, 329.
Bourgeoisie, 70, 258.
Brain Trust, 369, 377.
Brandenburg, 305.
Briand, Aristide, 61, 63.
Britain, 32, 173, 174, 175, 176, 188, 245,
 246, 260, 263, 269, 292, 306, 308,
 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 318,
 328, 329, 334, 335, 359, 365, 374.
British: bases, 372; **Cabinet Ministers**,
 265, 309, 311; **Commonwealth**, 320;
 Empire, 25, 32, 175, 187, 188, 267,
 302, 304, 308, 313, 314, 318, 319, 320,
 373; **Government**, 306, 309, 312, 325.
Brussels, 371.
Buddha, 253.
Bulgaria, 359.
Bundesgedanke (idea behind alliance),
 279.
Caesar, 139.
Canada, 20, 33, 174, 175, 372.
Canadian-U. S. Defense Committee, 372.
Canossa, 301.
Capital, 18, 42, 70, 108, 173, 328, 331,
 332, 337.
Capitalism, 51, 70, 76, 84, 146, 326, 337.
Capitalist (capitalistic), 10, 51, 116,
 153, 174, 215, 228, 246, 268, 272, 293,
 314, 321-340, 349, 354, 368, 377.
Carthage, 272, 312.
Casablanca, 372.
Chamberlain, 114, 173, 174, 308.
Champagne, 219.
Chancellor, 48, 51, 56, 59, 163, 173, 228,
 283, 302, 364, 368.
Cheops Pyramid, 139.
Chicago, 370.
Chicherin, 70.
China, 285, 371.
Christ (Saviour) 69, 70, 71, 72, 88, 253.
Christian, 4, 71, 72, 88, 150, 156, 374.
Christianity, 253, 262.
Churchill, 51, 174, 175, 176, 215, 272,
 296, 299, 300, 302, 308, 309, 316-18,
 347, 375.
Classes, 3, 19, 24, 33, 62, 73, 74, 76, 82,
 84, 96, 103, 104, 105, 106, 112, 117,
 118, 124, 142, 220, 234, 255, 284, 325,
 329, 333, 334, 335, 336, 368; middle
 class, 19, 37, 74, 76-77, 101, 102, 106,
 192, 207, 254; class warfare (con-
 flict) 219, 220, 255; working classes,
 69, 73, 102, 255.
Clausewitz, 6.
Clemenceau, 4, 6.

- Collapse, 8, 26, 69, 72, 74, 140, 142, 150, 153, 156, 161, 176, 219, 220, 222, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 237, 246, 253, 273, 286, 289, 335, 344, 370.
- Colonial possessions, 48, 210, 211, 241, 243, 323-4, 363.
- Colonies, 18, 25, 27, 48, 108, 176, 241, 243, 244, 246, 279, 303, 306, 307, 311, 355, 362, 363, 367.
- Colonization, 17, 27, 188.
- Columbia Broadcasting Company, 344.
- Columbus, 373.
- Comintern, 285.
- Commerce, 25, 285, 363.
- Committee of Investigation, 349.
- Communism, 251, 254, 262, 285, 292, 345.
- Communist (Communist), 51, 62, 70, 102, 103, 161, 203, 205, 206, 251, 256, 257, 265, 345.
- Community, 44, 45, 47, 48, 71, 79, 80, 81, 91, 94, 96, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 117, 118, 125, 129, 134, 135, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 162, 204, 206, 208, 209, 211, 222, 236, 245, 246, 255, 262, 264, 283, 287, 294, 300, 324, 329, 332, 338, 364, 365, 371.
- Compiègne, 233, 246.
- Compromise, 89, 212, 254.
- Conciliation, 4, 193, 221, 230, 234, 246, *see also* reconciliation.
- Confederacy, 356.
- Conquest, 181, 182.
- Consolidation, German, 59.
- Constitution, 13, 43, 49, 190, 299.
- Cook's Travel Bureaus, 142.
- Cooper, Duff, 51, 174, 299, 302, 347.
- Culture, 5, 7, 8, 12, 26, 38, 40, 44, 74, 81, 84, 117, 165, 168, 175, 188, 200, 203, 213, 214, 215, 220, 255, 259, 261, 264, 272, 273, 279, 284, 285, 286, 289, 293, 310, 311, 312, 316, 345, 364, 368, 369; culture politics, 137-157.
- Czechoslovakia, 114, 238, 279, 310; and France, 58; creation of, 239-40.
- Daily bread, 3, 4, 6, 18, 23, 27, 28, 29, 105, 162, 203, 209, 324.
- Daladier, 114.
- Danzig, 190, 212, 215, 267, 310.
- Decay, international idea of, 38.
- Democracy, 4, 13, 35-51, 76, 77, 78, 126, 134, 190, 211, 228, 239, 246, 262, 266, 282, 292, 293, 299, 302, 312, 313, 347, 353, 366, 368, 369; education for, 37; and Bolshevism, 50-51; of National Socialism, 46-47; pluto-democracy, 321-340.
- Democrat, 40, 337.
- Denmark, 185, 238, 359; Government, 371-2.
- Destiny, 8, 12, 13, 37, 38, 39, 93, 95, 98, 102, 105, 147, 173, 253, 254, 262, 294, 303.
- Destruction, 8, 9, 12, 38, 42, 56, 57, 72, 84, 89, 150, 247, 254, 307.
- Dictates, 9, 46, 94, 206, 211, 212, 214, 215, 230, 244, 307, 326, 345, 354, 373.
- Dictator, 209, 210, 211.
- Dictatorship, 46, 50, 51, 83, 110, 255, 262, 312, 375; democratic, 43-44.
- Diplomacy, 10, 241, 315; secret, 243, 246, 358.
- Disarmament, 60, 182, 213-14, 222, 233, 234, 243, 245, 246, 299, 300, 346, 361; Conference, 104.
- Disintegration of nations, 38.
- Dismemberment, 211.
- Dissolution of Germany, 18, 56-7, 60.
- Donovan, Colonel, 373.
- Downfall, 4, 12, 122, 214, 246, 373.
- Duerer, Albrecht, 345.
- Dunkirk, 317.
- Durchmarschrecht* (right of transit) 61.
- Eastern Front, 338.
- Eckart, Dietrich, 278.
- Economy, 18, 24, 25, 28, 38, 148, 211, 220, 254, 257, 258, 263, 264, 324, 328, 331, 364, 370.
- Eden, Anthony, 174, 260, 264, 299, 338, 347, 375.
- Education, 12, 43, 79, 80, 126, 128, 129, 130, 132, 150, 330, 364; for democracy, 37.
- Egypt (Egyptians) 144, 279, 302, 310, 313, 359.
- Elsner, Kurt, 56.

- Elbe, 17, 18, 27, 215.
 Encirclement, 58, 304, 306-7.
 Energy, 6, 21, 28, 32, 46, 55, 132, 219, 252, 266, 349, 364.
 England, 17, 18, 25, 26, 55, 57, 58, 62, 77, 171, 187, 188, 225, 227, 228, 236, 260, 263, 267, 271, 272, 277, 292, 294, 296, 297-320, 329, 334, 348, 359, 360, 367, 373, 374, 375, 376; world policy, 315.
 Enns, 18.
 Enslavement of Germany, 216.
 Entente, 65.
 Estonia, 359.
 Ethiopia (Abyssinia), 49, 285, 290, 291; emperor of, 284.
 Eton, 333.
 Europe, 22, 55, 56, 57, 58, 62, 63, 64, 70, 82, 83, 84, 97, 111, 142, 147, 149, 161, 165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 173, 181, 182, 184, 186, 189, 190, 193, 194, 199, 200, 203, 204, 205, 209, 211, 212, 213, 215, 228, 229, 230, 236, 237, 238, 239, 253, 255, 256, 259, 261, 262, 263, 264, 267, 268, 270, 271, 272, 273, 277, 282, 283, 284, 286, 288, 289, 290, 294, 302, 310, 314, 315, 316, 318, 319, 323, 337, 338, 339, 344, 346, 347, 349, 353, 358, 362, 365, 366, 370, 372, 374, 376; Balkanization of, 57; Central, 113, 209, 210, 239, 242, 260, 310.
 European Continent, 199-200, 271, 273, 314, 315, 317, 318, 366.
 Expansionism, basis of, 19-21.
 Export, 25, 26, 200, 209, 324, 371.
 Factors of power, 10, 21, 22, 23, 27.
 Faith, 19, 41, 77, 89, 92, 96, 101, 102, 106, 107, 109, 111, 115, 127, 135, 144, 148, 166, 167, 214, 221, 222, 224, 226, 228, 229, 236, 243, 244, 252, 254, 255, 311, 339, 357, 369.
 Far East, 285, 289, 314, 319, 338.
 Fascism, 139, 280, 290, 292, 293.
 Fascist, 82, 83, 139, 280, 282, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291, 292, 294; revolution, 283, 287, 293, 295, 296.
 Fascist Italy, *see* Italy.
 Fate, 3, 11, 12, 13, 18, 19, 21, 28, 41, 42, 61, 77, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 98, 101, 103, 104, 105, 115, 121, 140, 175, 212, 221, 223, 237, 240, 242, 245, 254, 280, 288, 290, 291, 293, 300, 303, 310, 313, 339, 356, 363, 368.
 Fatherland, 20, 39, 76, 89, 101, 221, 222, 281.
 Festubert, 219.
 Fifth column, 326.
 Finland (Finns), 269, 271, 359.
 Flanders, 219.
 Florence, 290.
 Force, (forces), 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 29, 30, 32, 33, 40, 45, 48, 49, 50, 83, 92, 102, 109, 112, 116, 123, 134, 140, 141, 146, 147, 154, 156, 164, 167, 169, 181, 188, 206, 214, 219, 221, 230, 236, 238, 246, 252, 255, 259, 264, 265, 266, 273, 280, 281, 291, 299, 301, 302, 304, 312, 313, 314, 319, 323, 328, 339, 346, 351, 352, 353, 360, 368, 373, 374, 377; air force, 172, 289, 316, 372; armed forces, 10, 11, 115, 118, 177, 359; military force, 258, 270.
 Foreign affairs, 18, 41, 58, 139.
 Foreign office, 41.
 Four-Year-Plan, 325.
 Fourteen Points, 227, 230, 231-248.
 France, 5, 17, 18, 53-65, 76, 95, 165, 171, 173, 174, 176, 182, 186, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 204, 226, 228, 264, 269, 277, 278, 279, 280, 287, 295, 296, 300, 309, 310, 313, 315, 328, 329, 335, 347, 348, 359, 366, 372; and Czechoslovakia, 58; and Italy, 62, 63, 64, 65, 277-80; and Poland, 58; and Roosevelt, 366; mortal enemy, 53-65.
 Franco, General, 291.
 Franco-British claim, 214.
 Franco-German relations, 195; territorial disputes, 193, 194; understanding, 194.
 Frederick the Great, 6, 139.
 Freedom, 20, 38, 40, 44, 45, 51, 87, 89, 91, 95, 97, 102, 114, 130, 134, 142, 148, 163, 167, 170, 182, 187, 220, 221, 224, 227, 237, 238, 240, 242, 258, 278, 293, 295, 299, 304, 308, 310, 311, 312,

- 328, 337, 349, 353, 355, 359, 360, 378;
of individual, 44, 45; of press, 328.
- Free Mason (masonic) 63, 65, 296, 326,
327, 375.
- Free Masonry, 278.
- Freiburg, 175.
- French: Empire, 139; Government, 55,
192; National State, 318; Republic,
139.
- Frontier, 173, 185, 186, 191, 199, 208,
215, 236, 237, 242, 253, 265, 268, 270,
272, 273, 287, 288, 310, 333, 347, 372;
revision of 27-8, 171; Rhine frontier,
59.
- Fuehrer, 93, 108, 111, 114, 117, 173, 191,
259, 283, 287, 299, 350, 367, 368; *see*
also leader.
- Garmisch-Partenkirchen, 192.
- Gefolgschaft (following), 126.
- Gefolgschaftstreue (loyalty to the fol-
lowing), 129-30.
- Gemeinschaft (community), 94.
- Gemeinschaftsleistung (communal
achievement), 147.
- General Staff, 112.
- Geneva, 50, 51, 214, 239.
- Genius, 8, 12, 13, 39, 42, 141, 146, 147,
220, 244, 294, 315, 318, 330.
- Gerlich, 278.
- German: army, 11, 60, 219, 224, 228,
259, 291; Cabinet, 163; Confedera-
tion, 280, 291; consulates, 374; em-
pire, 64, 214, 288; Government, 43,
60, 62, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187,
189, 216, 229, 292, 293, 307, 309, 346,
347, 355, 358, 360, 367, 372; Informa-
tion Library, 374; nation, 28, 29, 30,
31, 42, 45, 49, 62, 63, 191, 202, 203,
206, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 222,
226, 227, 230, 238, 242, 247, 254, 259,
272, 282, 283, 287, 299, 306, 307, 308-
9, 310, 316, 324, 331, 339, 347, 348,
356, 357, 358, 365, 375; peasants
(farmers), 27, 29, 106, 112, 116, 192,
203, 256, 324, 331; people, 7, 8, 10,
19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31,
37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 56,
57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 77, 81, 88, 89, 90,
91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 102, 104, 105,
106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114,
115, 116, 117, 122, 125, 126, 127, 129,
133, 134, 141, 152, 162, 163, 164, 166,
167, 168, 169, 170, 173, 181, 183, 184,
189, 190, 192, 193, 195, 205, 206, 210,
212, 214, 219, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225,
226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 233, 234, 235,
236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 244, 245, 246,
247, 252, 253, 254, 257, 258, 259, 261,
263, 266, 270, 282, 283, 284, 286, 287,
288, 290, 291, 294, 295, 300, 301, 302,
304, 305, 307, 308, 311, 314, 315, 319,
332, 335, 338, 344, 345, 346, 348, 350,
351, 353, 356, 362, 364, 367, 375;
problem, 9, 30; Press Agency, 374;
German Reich, *see* Reich; Reichsbank
central office, 374; Republic, 59, 60;
State, 62, 130, 146, 252; Transocean,
374; workers, 47, 74, 105, 106, 116,
192, 203.
- Germanization, 165.
- Germany, 9, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23,
27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43,
45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 57,
58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 72, 76, 77,
78, 80, 81, 83, 87, 90, 93, 97, 101, 102,
103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112,
113, 115, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124,
125, 127, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 139,
143, 147, 150, 156, 116, 162, 163, 165,
166, 169, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177,
182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191,
192, 193, 194, 195, 200, 201, 202, 203,
204, 205, 206, 207, 209, 210, 211, 212,
213, 214, 215, 216, 219, 221, 222, 224,
225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 233, 234, 236,
237, 238, 239, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246,
251, 253, 254, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260,
261, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269,
270, 272, 273, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282,
283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291,
292, 293, 295, 299, 300, 301, 303, 304,
305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312,
313, 314, 315, 317, 319, 320, 323, 324,
325, 326, 327, 329, 333, 335, 337, 338,
339, 340, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348,
349, 351, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360,
361, 362, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369,

- 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376; and League of Nations, 47-50; Balkanization of, 57, 64; dissolution of, 18, 56-57, 60; National Socialist, 45, 47, 82, 181, 210, 261, 267, 290, 291, 292, 293, 301, 311, 339, 340, 348, 369; and Italy, 277-296; Young Germany, 119-135.
- Ghengis Khan, 154, 270.
- Girondist, 259.
- God (Lord, Almighty), 3, 4, 23, 24, 29, 31, 38, 39, 40, 51, 72, 77, 80, 82, 85-98, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 122, 134, 147, 152, 154, 164, 171, 173, 238, 257, 264, 278, 302, 311, 313, 314, 323, 357, 375.
- Goethe, 79, 345.
- Gold standard, 330, 335-6.
- Graudenz, 310.
- Greece (Hellas), 142, 156, 317, 373.
- Greenland, 374.
- Greer, U. S. destroyer, 374.
- Guarantees to Western nations, 186.
- Habsburg, 210.
- Haendel, 345.
- Halifax, Lord, 310.
- Hamburg, 101, 153, 345.
- Hate (hatred), 5, 83, 101, 163, 167, 168, 170, 192, 203, 205, 208, 209, 210, 215, 234, 264, 283, 293, 303, 307, 325, 334, 345, 347, 348.
- Have and have-nots, 323-5, 328-333.
- Health, 24, 116, 129, 132, 134, 150.
- Hearst, Randolph, 344.
- Hearst Press, 343, 344.
- Hedin, Sven, 177.
- Heidelberg, 345.
- Heritage, 12, 27, 28, 38, 157.
- Herrenvolk* (master race), 75.
- Hindenburg, 106, 164.
- Hitler, Adolf, 228; Hitler schools, 333; reply to Roosevelt, 350-65; Hitler Youth, 123, 131, 132.
- Holbein, Hans, 345.
- Holland, 63, 186, 359; émigré government, 372.
- Holy Roman Empire, 304.
- Honor, 18, 39, 61, 89, 91, 92, 96, 97, 101, 103, 104, 110, 111, 124, 125, 130, 140, 161, 162, 163, 164, 167, 169, 170, 181, 195, 203, 215, 224, 225, 228, 235, 257, 260, 266, 281, 283, 285, 291, 294, 326, 366, 375.
- Hore-Belisha, 174.
- House of Commons, 272, 299.
- House of Representatives, 349.
- Hradschin Castle, 304.
- Humanitarianism, 5.
- Humanity, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 45, 48, 71, 76, 80, 107, 148, 162, 164, 167, 174, 188, 210, 212, 255, 260, 284, 308, 327, 334, 352, 354, 355, 363, 366; *see also* mankind.
- Hungary, 83, 359.
- Huns, 278.
- Iceland, 374.
- Ickes, Harold, 347.
- Idarwald, 373.
- Imperialism (imperialist), 5, 258, 277, 278.
- Imperium, 280.
- Indemnities, 243, 245.
- Independent Socialist, 56, 70.
- India, 279, 302, 310, 311, 320, 329, 339.
- Individual, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 32, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 80, 81, 90, 106, 112, 117, 128, 148, 149, 150, 155, 169, 211, 220, 223, 228, 229, 253, 313, 332, 334, 364; freedom of, 44, 45.
- Individualism, 76.
- Individuality, 42, 114, 219; Germanic concept of, 76.
- Industrialization, 22.
- Industry, 25, 28, 153, 174, 207, 324, 332.
- Inflation, 207, 368.
- Injustice, 28, 48, 49, 199, 206, 212, 213, 216, 238, 244, 295, 325, 347; institution of, 47-50.
- Innsbruck, 242.
- Intelligentsia, 73, 74, 75, 84, 220.
- Internationale, 24, 221, 255, 283.
- Internationalism, 4, 13, 35-51, 76, 84, 220, 327.
- Iran, 359.
- Iraq, 359.

- Ireland, 359.
 Isolation, 277.
 Italian: Government, 287; navy and airforce, 289; State, 291.
 Italy, 5, 32, 49, 55, 62, 63, 64, 65, 139, 142, 165, 277-296, 299, 314, 315, 318, 319, 358, 365, 366, 373, 375, 376; and Abyssinia, 49; and France, 62, 63, 64, 65, 277-280; Bismarck and, 62, 64; Fascist, 82, 83, 282, 283, 284, 287, 288, 290, 291, 292, 294, 300; King of, 284.
 Jacobin, 59, 259.
 Japan, 48, 284, 285, 286, 289, 293, 296, 319, 320, 338, 374, 375, 376; and League of Nations, 48.
 Jerusalem, 146.
 Jews, 4, 37, 38, 51, 65, 67-84, 96, 101, 140, 141, 146, 155, 156, 210, 215, 220, 227, 230, 246, 252, 258, 260, 264, 265, 269, 270, 278, 325, 326, 327, 333, 334, 335, 337, 338, 339, 340, 343, 348, 349, 360, 369, 370, 375, 377; aims of, 78; and middle class, 76-77; destroyer of civilization, 73-75.
 Jewry, 82, 83, 155, 247, 265, 273, 289, 296, 848, 370.
 Judaism, 76, 146.
 Judaization, 76, 79.
 Jungvolk, 131.
 Justice, 23, 29, 48, 49, 50, 56, 95, 167, 207, 212, 214, 221, 227, 233, 235, 238, 246, 247, 292, 308, 311, 312, 323, 354, 357, 365.
 Kaiser, 117, 340.
 Kant, 345.
 Kearney, U. S. destroyer, 374.
 Kerensky, 259.
 Knox, Frank, 374.
 Koenigsberg, 101, 252.
 Koenigsmacher (Royalists), 251.
 Konjunktur (competition), 26.
 Kremlin, 272.
 Krupp steel, 125.
 Kulturduenger der Welt (carriers of culture throughout the world) 26.
 Landtag, 71.
 La Plata, 373.
 Latvia, 359.
 Law, 49, 51, 79, 80, 83, 123, 143, 150, 169, 183, 200, 207, 214, 235, 269, 302, 303, 354, 371, 373, 376; of nature (life), 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 37, 38, 46; racial, 77.
 Leader, 4, 7, 9, 12, 21, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 47, 51, 70, 74, 83, 84, 94, 98, 102, 104, 109, 110, 119-135, 149, 164, 166, 173, 175, 189, 190, 212, 219, 220, 221, 226, 227, 257, 258, 259, 264, 302, 324, 334, 351, 352, 356, 362, 369; authority of, 39, 41; of achievement, 123; *see also Fuehrer*.
 Leadership, 8, 9, 12, 13, 39, 42, 43, 46, 47, 73, 75, 82, 83, 84, 92, 93, 97, 105, 106, 107, 108, 119-135, 146, 148, 150, 163, 214, 219, 220, 228, 229, 293, 294, 299, 326, 343, 344, 363, 369; authority of, 42.
 League of German Girls, 131.
 League of Nations, 39, 47-50, 61, 104, 184, 189-90, 201, 207, 214, 233, 235, 244, 246, 285, 286, 309, 355, 357; Covenant of, 241; institution of injustice, 47-50; Stresemann and, 61.
 Lease-Lend, 373.
 Lebensraum, 15-33, 324; *see also* space, territory, soil.
 Left, the, 58, 73, 74, 76.
 Leipzig, battle of, 61.
 Lenin, 253.
 Lerchenfeld, Count, 71.
 Liberalism, 254, 282.
 Liechtenstein, 359.
 Lithuania, 27, 359.
 Locarno, 61, 182, 183.
 London, 175, 238, 306, 316, 326, 371.
 Loos, 219.
 Loretto, 219.
 Ludwig I, king of Bavaria, 140, 141, 142.
 Ludwig II, king of Bavaria, 140, 141.
 Lueger, Karl, 139.
 Luxemburg, 359.
 Machtfactor (factor of power), 21.
 Matfeld, 288.

- Majority, 4, 6, 8, 12, 37, 38, 42, 49, 51, 70, 76, 203, 219, 220, 223, 233, 238, 302, 357.
- Manchukuo, 50.
- Mandate, 44, 90.
- Mangoni, 373.
- Mankind, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 44, 80, 96, 97, 146, 148, 153, 161, 168, 188, 202, 205, 207, 211, 233, 235, 244, 265, 285, 288, 318, 346, 351, 354, 365, 375; *see also* humanity.
- Man-power, 22.
- Marches, 27.
- Markets, 22, 25, 26, 28, 200, 207, 325, 331, 343, 362.
- Marseillaise, 252.
- Marxism, 12, 78, 88, 102, 148, 251, 252, 254, 292; *poison of*, 219-221.
- Marxist (Marxian), 5, 24, 65, 73, 80, 88, 122, 155, 223, 234, 246, 262, 264, 280, 283, 339.
- Mass, 37, 60, 148, 163, 209, 221.
- Masses, 6, 8, 13, 40, 41, 43, 55, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 84, 103, 104, 105, 152, 220, 222, 230, 273, 327, 329, 330, 332, 335, 337.
- May, first of, 38, 101, 108, 109, 316, 325.
- Mayas, 145.
- Mediocrity of numbers, 42-43.
- Mediterranean, 32, 277, 278, 279.
- Middle Ages, 139, 145.
- Might, 9, 21, 28, 48, 306, 315.
- Milan, 366.
- Militarism, 37, 309, 346.
- Minority, 37, 215, 236, 308.
- Mission, 84, 89, 92, 94, 107, 144, 145, 162, 245, 252, 255, 283, 319.
- Mohammedanism, 262.
- Mommsen, Theodore, 71, 84.
- Monarchist, 101.
- Mongol, 270, 272, 273.
- Monroe Doctrine, 346, 358, 371.
- Morale, 116, 247.
- Moscow, 51, 258, 260, 261, 264, 265, 266, 270, 272, 345.
- Movement, 11, 27, 38, 39, 41, 42, 72, 87, 88, 89, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 111, 112, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 129, 130-1, 141, 151, 161, 166, 187, 221, 251, 254, 257, 278, 286, 290, 335, 368; National Socialist, 64, 80, 81, 130, 133, 141, 145, 203, 213, 215, 225, 252, 273, 287, 326, 338, 340, 344-6.
- Mozart, 345.
- Muenchener Neueste Nachrichten, 278.
- Munich, 140, 141, 142, 143, 151, 153, 326.
- Mussolini, 64, 173, 277, 278, 280, 281, 282, 283, 286, 287, 288, 290, 293, 295, 350, 371; *in* Berlin, 282-284.
- Napoleon, 47.
- National Socialism, 45, 47, 80, 81, 89, 123, 130, 145, 153, 156, 164, 165, 181, 238, 255, 256, 260, 282, 290, 293, 295, 327, 334, 335, 368, 375; *democracy of*, 46.
- National Socialist, 5, 18, 19, 22, 25, 37, 42, 45, 77, 78, 79, 80, 84, 101, 103, 115, 117, 118, 123, 130, 131, 134, 140, 146, 150, 161, 163, 165, 166, 181, 187, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 264, 281, 294, 305, 309, 323, 330, 332, 333, 337, 345, 348, 369; *art.* 147-151; *Germany*, 45, 47, 82, 181, 210, 261, 267, 288, 290, 291, 292, 294, 301, 311, 339, 340, 348, 369; *movement*, 64, 80, 81, 130, 133, 141, 145, 203, 213, 215, 225, 252, 273, 287, 326, 338, 340, 344-6; *Party*, 41, 55, 91, 106, 107, 110, 133, 153, 256, 344-6; *Revolution*, 157, 164, 166, 257, 283, 293; *State*, 43, 109, 149, 150, 153, 177, 182, 190, 280, 283, 285, 291, 332.
- Nationalism, 39, 41, 64, 165, 237.
- Nationalist, 41, 57, 103, 189, 259, 278, 279, 313.
- Nationality, principle of, 199.
- Nazis (Nazism), 12, 98, 310.
- Near East, 373.
- Negroes, 40, 155, 174, 241, 279, 353.
- Neutrality, 186; *law*, 371.
- New Deal, 369.
- Nieuve-Chappele, 219.
- Nordics, 5.
- North Sea, 203.
- Norway, 185, 317, 359; *Government*, 372.

- November crime, 103, 221.
 November traitors, 10.
 Nuremberg, 123, 151, 240.
- Oberammergau, 69.
 Occident, 155.
 Occupation policy, 55.
 Oder, 215.
 Odenwald, 374.
 Olympic Stadium, 192, 282.
 Oppression, 3, 95, 211, 222, 239, 279, 282.
 Order, 209, 210, 211, 212, 269, 281, 287, 293, 301, 320, 364, 369, 376, 377; new order, 168, 175, 201, 237; social, 262, 265, 273, 375; world, 49, 204, 205, 207, 210, 221, 227.
 Organization, 9, 12, 44, 45, 117, 123, 124, 126, 148, 152, 162, 209, 220, 254, 255, 256, 259, 290, 329, 343; State Central Organization, 70; Youth Hostels, 132; Youth, 122, 123, 131.
Ostmark, see Austria.
- Pacifism (pacifist), 4, 13, 20, 35-51, 78, 123, 223, 227.
 Pacts, 112, 182, 183, 268, 285, 352; Anti-Comintern, 289; German-Japanese, 285; non-aggression, 183, 185, 189, 190, 266, 347, 371; Russo-German, 266, 268; tripartite, 376, 377.
 Paris, 63, 139, 171, 238, 326, 371.
 Palazzo Venezia, speech, 287, 289.
 Palestine, 302, 303, 310, 359, 360.
 Parliament, 29, 37, 44, 223, 251, 301, 330.
 Parliamentarianism, 37, 39, 189.
Parteiverbrecher, buergerliche (criminals of the Right), 221.
 Parthenon, 145.
 Parties, 12, 19, 20, 31, 42, 51, 87, 88, 89, 96, 101, 102, 103, 118, 121, 124, 128, 132, 142, 151, 187, 188, 206, 212, 221, 222, 251, 257, 259, 260, 280, 285, 286, 296, 302, 329, 337, 344, 357, 368; British Labor, 330, Center, 88, 246; Communist, 206; National Socialist, 41, 55, 91, 106, 107, 110, 133, 153, 256, 344-6; Reich's Party Convention, 114.
- Passion plays, 69.
 Peace, 4, 6, 9, 11, 26, 31, 39, 41, 76, 91, 97, 103, 104, 111, 113, 114, 117, 122, 124, 153, 159-177, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 199, 200, 202, 204, 206, 207, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 224, 225, 230, 233, 235, 236, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 259, 268, 279, 280, 282, 284, 285, 287, 289, 290, 296, 299, 300, 301, 304, 307, 309, 312, 319, 326, 333, 336, 337, 338, 346, 347, 348, 349, 353, 357, 358, 363, 365, 369, 370, 372, 376; treaty, 11, 47, 197-216, 234, 238, 280, 306, 351, 355, 361.
 Peasants (peasantry), 24, 25, 26, 27, 108, 192, 258, 271, 339, 363, 364; German, 27, 29, 106, 112, 116, 192, 203, 256, 324, 331.
 Pharaohs, 142.
Phrygia, 373.
 Pilsudski, Marshal, 189, 190.
 Plebiscite, 48, 162, 191, 193, 215, 238, 241, 245, 311, 333.
 Pledges, 179-195, 361.
 Poland, 58, 94-95, 165, 171, 172, 173, 177, 188, 189, 190, 204, 215, 278, 279, 310, 326, 347, 359, 366, 367-8; non-aggression pact with, 189, 190; and Roosevelt, 366, 368; Polish Corridor, 204.
 Policy, 10, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 63, 64, 88, 104, 164, 166, 168, 181, 182, 223, 233, 244, 263, 277, 278, 280, 285, 286, 305, 307, 309, 312, 314, 315, 318, 326, 328, 335, 336, 357, 358, 359, 369, 375; domestic, 9, 10, 323; foreign, 9, 10, 18, 20, 39, 59-65, 78, 164, 170, 216, 223, 267, 268, 280, 281, 294, 323, 335, 358, 370; of encirclement, 304, 306-307; Stresemann's, 59-61.
 Politicians, 18, 43, 48, 64, 166, 174, 175, 209, 228, 269, 284, 306, 307, 310, 317, 348, 349, 352.
 Politics, 3, 4, 6, 9, 23, 45, 56, 57, 147, 150, 155, 184, 221, 223, 277, 280, 281, 307; and art, 141-3; culture politics, 137-157.

- Pope Leo, 251.
- Population, 4, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31, 165, 175, 181, 200, 203, 211, 230, 255, 277, 278, 316, 364.
- Portugal, 359.
- Posen, 310.
- Potocki, Count, 368, 370.
- Power (powers), 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 38, 41, 46, 48, 51, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 76, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 107, 112, 115, 122, 123, 131, 133, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 151, 154, 156, 163, 183, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 215, 221, 222, 225, 234, 235, 236, 238, 241, 243, 253, 259, 261, 266, 268, 269, 270, 272, 273, 277, 279, 280, 281, 283, 286, 289, 291, 293, 299, 303, 304, 307, 314, 315, 319, 320, 324, 330, 331, 332, 336, 339, 346, 348, 349, 353, 354, 357, 360, 363, 364, 367, 368, 369, 373, 376, 377; balance of, 57, 223, 314, 315, 318, 319, 320; factors of, 10, 21, 22, 23, 27.
- Prague, 240, 310.
- Press, 20, 29, 37, 47, 50, 55, 74, 76, 82, 155, 192, 194, 210, 291, 306, 325, 328, 329, 343, 348, 349, 350, 351, 357, 358; freedom of the 328; Hearst, 343, 344.
- Production, 25, 26, 32, 201, 253, 263, 324, 331, 336, 362.
- Profiteers, 170, 171, 215, 247, 326, 348.
- Proletariat (Proletarians), 19, 74, 78, 83, 84, 101, 106; dictatorship of, 50; rule of, 83.
- Promises, 179-195, 213, 228, 229, 230, 353, 355, 361, 362, 363; *see also* pledges.
- Propaganda, 77, 82, 156, 171, 228, 313, 316, 343, 344, 348; poison of, 225, 349.
- Property: private, 73, 220, 256; state, 220.
- Prosperity, 25, 117, 164, 172, 188, 329, 337, 369.
- Providence, 20, 31, 32, 47, 80, 85-98, 103, 107, 127, 130, 146, 164, 177, 226, 245, 288, 363, 365.
- Prussia, 291, 305, 315; King of, 291; army, 10; state, 18.
- Public opinion, 37, 185, 210, 328, 329, 347, 370; hoodwinking of, 50.
- Race, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 27, 38, 39, 70, 72, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 88, 122, 126, 132, 144, 146, 155, 210, 220, 230, 233, 253, 285, 286, 288, 290; master race, 75.
- Racial, 76, 77, 79, 81, 142, 143; purity, 76, 80-81.
- Rasse-Willen* (racial will), 142.
- Raw materials, 26, 32, 108, 200, 207, 211, 311, 324, 325, 331, 362.
- Realpolitik*, 280-81.
- Rearmament, 29, 112, 361.
- Reconciliation, 5, 39, 58, 163, 164, 169, 181, 191, 233, 234, 243, 245, 247; *see also* conciliation.
- Red Cross, 172.
- Red frontfighters, 251.
- Red Sea, 373.
- Reformation, 262.
- Regeneration, 40-41, 57, 58.
- Regime, 29, 30, 43, 45, 46, 50, 51, 65, 109, 110, 139, 146, 228, 258, 266, 267, 283, 290, 294, 299, 300, 301, 302, 308, 363, 369.
- Reich*, 3, 11, 39, 47, 48, 56, 60, 83, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 101, 102, 106, 109, 115, 117, 121, 124, 127, 128, 129, 131, 133, 135, 141, 147, 151, 153, 155, 161, 162, 163, 164, 170, 172, 173, 176, 177, 184, 186, 189, 193, 194, 213, 214, 222, 223, 225, 226, 228, 229, 236, 237, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 264, 270, 271, 280, 283, 286, 290, 293, 300, 301, 304, 305, 307, 310, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 323, 324, 326, 334, 339, 343, 348, 350, 353, 358, 364, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 375; Achilles heel of, 223; apprentice competition, 131; party convention, 114; Second *Reich*, 116, 305; sport competition, 131; Third *Reich*, 102, 116, 140, 151, 152, 155, 326.
- Reichsmark*, 331.

- Reichstag*, 83, 88, 113, 162, 172, 242, 268, 312, 330, 336, 350, 357, 361, 372.
- Reinhardt, Max, 140, 142.
- Religion, 142, 145, 174, 253, 255, 280.
- Reparations, 55, 200, 206, 207, 210, 245, 301, 362.
- Republic, 55, 59, 60, 102, 121, 343, 358.
- Republican, 101, 294.
- Resources, 210, 226, 272, 320, 363; natural, 74, 200, 206, 207, 329.
- Responsibility, 19, 98, 102, 132, 164, 210, 215, 236, 256, 257, 259, 282, 286, 357, 363.
- Revenge, 181, 182, 208, 221, 334, 348, 370; no thoughts of, 170-1, 182.
- Revision, 193, 194, 199, 212, 213, 214, 215, 241, 326, 333, 371.
- Revolution, 10, 37, 46, 57, 71, 75, 80, 81, 84, 95, 141, 152, 166, 203, 205, 206, 208, 210, 223, 224, 230, 246, 247, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 261, 262, 279, 293, 294, 295, 296, 334, 345, 366; Fascist, 283, 287, 293, 295, 296; National Socialist, 157, 164, 166, 257, 283, 293.
- Revolutionary: center, 265; Government, 56.
- Reynaud, Paul, 174, 372.
- Rhein*, 373.
- Rhine, 20, 27, 58, 59, 60, 61, 203, 261, 310.
- Rhineland, 55, 61, 109, 167, 176, 279, 346.
- Rights, 3, 7, 10, 11, 17, 19, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 37, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 49, 51, 59, 60, 61, 71, 73, 84, 92, 95, 101, 103, 104, 105, 110, 111, 113, 115, 133, 134, 162, 163, 164, 166, 169, 170, 171, 173, 181, 182, 184, 190, 193, 202, 206, 208, 209, 212, 213, 214, 216, 220, 224, 227, 230, 233, 234, 237-238, 239, 241, 243, 244, 246, 247, 255, 261, 271, 281, 282, 283, 290, 299, 301, 302, 303, 307, 308, 309, 310, 346, 347, 354, 357, 358, 359, 362, 371, 375; of selfdetermination, 51, 209, 212, 236, 238, 240, 242, 243, 245; to work, 337.
- Right, the, 58, 73, 74, 76, 221.
- Rome, 64, 72, 139, 142, 287, 288, 290, 312, 318; and Carthage, 272, 312; Hitler in Rome, 287-89.
- Roosevelt, 246, 296, 337, 339, 340, 341-377; and France, 366; and Poland, 366, 368; Hitler's reply to, 350-365.
- Rosenberg, 21.
- Royalist, 59, 251.
- Ruhr, 55.
- Rumania, 268, 269, 270, 279, 359.
- Russia, 22, 29, 76, 77, 83, 84, 171, 226, 256, 257, 258, 260, 261, 264, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 272, 319, 359, 367; *see also* Soviet Russia.
- Russo-German pact, 266, 268.
- Saar, 55, 191, 193, 194, 279, 333; question, 171, 182, 191.
- Saarbruecken, 301.
- Sacrifice, 11, 13, 28, 33, 60, 61, 73, 77, 83, 87, 89, 108, 115, 116, 122, 123, 127, 129, 130, 145, 148, 165, 176, 182, 191, 199, 221, 225, 233, 260, 270, 271, 281, 301, 305, 318, 319, 320, 325, 333, 338, 347.
- St. Germain, 277.
- St. Veits Cathedral, 304.
- Sanctions, 201, 351.
- Scandinavian states, 185.
- Schiller, 345.
- Schirach, von, 124, 128.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur, 78, 346.
- Schubert, 345.
- Schuschnigg, Dr. Kurt, 51, 93, 114, 241, 242.
- Security, 49, 95, 172, 186, 187, 191, 225, 233, 234, 258, 285, 286, 301, 310, 347, 348, 373.
- Sedan, 315.
- Selection, 7, 12, 46, 47.
- Self-determination, 43, 51, 113, 209, 212, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 245, 308.
- Self-preservation, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 37, 38, 58, 214, 222, 223, 254, 345, 348.
- Siebenburgen, 279.
- Siegfried, 221.
- Silesia, 279.
- Simovitch, General, 373.

- Sioux tribes, 356.
 Slovakia, 240.
 Social Democrats (democracy), 64, 73, 254.
 Social labor legislation, 325, 327.
 Social welfare, 325.
 Socialism (socialist), 10, 33, 41, 47, 70, 103, 220, 258.
 Sofia, 373.
 Soil, 4, 6, 15-33, 70, 80, 84, 124, 200, 226, 287, 288, 296, 324, 364.
 Sommes, 219.
 Sovereignty, 61, 184, 185, 241, 353.
 Soviet, 70, 101, 129, 258, 345; Russia (State, Union), 9, 70, 114, 255, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271, 285, 291, 310, 351, 374, 375.
 Spaa, 227.
 Space, 6, 15-33, 95, 181, 209, 355, 377; living-space, 95, 167, 209, 210, 213, 268, 303, 304, 306, 310, 314, 355, 364; *see also Lebensraum*, soil, territory.
 Spain, 84, 257, 259, 260, 263, 272, 286, 315, 359.
 Stab in the back, 217-230.
 Stalin, 265, 267, 292.
 Standard of living, 30, 44, 200, 207, 244, 255, 256, 258, 271, 325, 329.
 State Central Organization, 70.
 Stock exchange (market), 74, 76, 220, 326, 327, 343.
 Storm Troops, 121, 123, 259.
 Strassburg, 101, 193.
 Strength, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 33, 39, 40, 41, 42, 55, 71, 72, 92, 97, 106, 107, 109, 111, 112, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 134, 140, 144, 147, 154, 164, 165, 167, 216, 219, 226, 236, 239, 242, 270, 283, 284, 289, 291, 292, 293, 305, 314, 318, 319, 320, 325, 331, 336, 340, 354, 356, 357, 361, 375; through Joy, 152.
 Stresemann, Gustav, 48, 59, 61, 63, 278, 281; policy, 59-61.
 Strife, 13, 55, 81, 162, 181, 207, 266, 314.
 Struggle, 3-13, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28, 30, 32, 41, 45, 57, 60, 62, 73, 78, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 102, 103, 105, 106, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 130, 133, 145, 153, 154, 167, 173, 174, 175, 187, 192, 200, 207, 212, 216, 219, 226, 230, 236, 256, 260, 261, 262, 264, 271, 272, 273, 279, 280, 281, 288, 290, 296, 304, 305, 314, 324, 327, 335, 338, 345, 356, 365, 375, 376; father of all things, 7, 8, 17, 39, 40; for existence, 8-13, 17, 29, 44, 211.
Sturmabteilung (Storm Troopers), 123.
 Sudeten Germans, 239, 240.
 Swastika, 101, 129; in the sign of, 127-129.
 Sweden, 185, 359.
 Switzerland, 63, 359.
 Sword, 9, 22, 23, 27, 38, 154, 215, 258, 285.
 Syria, 359.
 Territory, 15-33, 48, 60, 61, 181, 184, 185, 186, 188, 189, 191, 193, 200, 210, 214, 227, 265, 269, 270, 271, 281, 286, 306, 309, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 371, 372; *see also Lebensraum*, soil, space.
 Terror, 37, 170, 215, 255, 279.
 Thames, 260, 310.
 Thorn, 310.
 Totalitarian state, 314, 347; *see also* authoritarian.
 Trade, 25, 26, 27, 200, 207, 209, 263, 285, 306, 307, 309, 332, 336, 362, 363, 364; relations, 30.
 Treaty, 9, 32, 61, 169, 182, 183, 189, 194, 243, 261, 295, 301, 302, 307, 324, 347, 354, 356, 362, 364; Anglo-German naval accord, 301, 304, 306; of Muenster, 31; of Versailles, *see* Versailles; peace treaty, 11, 47, 197-216, 234, 238, 280, 306, 351, 355, 361.
 Trenton, U. S. cruiser, 373.
 Tsarism, 280.
 Turkey, 269, 359.
 Tyrol, South, 277, 279, 280, 281.
 U-boat, 374, 376.
 Ukraine, 267, 268, 269.
 Understanding, 12, 39, 61, 62, 81, 104, 107, 127, 130, 145, 155, 161, 167, 168,

- 176, 181, 182, 183, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 202, 208, 213, 215, 220, 230, 235, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 266, 283, 284, 292, 294, 306, 309, 333, 368, 370, 376; Franco-German, 194.
- Unemployed (unemployment), 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 207, 210, 325, 329, 331, 336, 338, 339, 364, 369.
- United State, *see* America.
- Unity, 18, 21, 32, 46, 81, 129, 131, 134, 141, 149, 162, 164, 224, 237, 292, 314, 315, 364.
- Urals, 267, 268, 272.
- Uraether* (primeval substance), 141.
- Urordnung* (primeval order), 141.
- Urproduktion* (agricultural production), 25.
- Utopia, 223.
- Valera, de, 359-360.
- Vatican, 280.
- Versailles, 49, 58, 103, 227, 229, 230, 233, 234, 238, 240, 245, 320, 345, 361; treaty of, 28, 58, 61, 183, 184, 185, 197-216, 224, 239, 241, 245, 306, 307, 326, 345, 347, 351, 354, 355, 364.
- Vienna, 101, 139, 310.
- Vistula, 310.
- Vladivostok, 252, 253.
- Volksgenosse*, 71, 79, 91, 108, 109, 112, 113, 134, 215, 222, 224, 243, 257, 300, 313, 317, 329, 331, 333.
- Folksheer* (people's army), 75.
- Folkspartei* (People's Party), 79.
- Volkstum* (heritage and tradition of the people), 38.
- Wagner, Richard, 5, 141, 345.
- Want, 20, 70, 148, 210.
- War, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 19, 20, 26, 28, 30, 31, 41, 57, 58, 60, 61, 69, 76, 82, 92, 94, 96, 97, 102, 105, 114, 116, 117, 118, 125, 127, 142, 143, 161, 163, 165, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 181, 183, 184, 185, 187, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 201, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 215, 219, 223, 224, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 240, 242, 243, 244, 246, 262, 266, 267, 272, 273, 277, 279, 280, 281, 290, 295, 296, 299, 300, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 330, 332, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 371, 372, 374, 375, 376, 377; guilt, 202, 204, 223, 225, 233; civil war, 17, 84, 256, 278, 356; Napoleonic wars, 319; Punic wars, 312; Thirty Years' War, 17, 31; U. S. and World War I, 343-344; of Liberation, 17; World War, 17, 18, 60, 82, 117, 192, 193, 199, 202, 212, 230, 233, 246, 247, 266, 273, 280, 307, 308, 315, 320, 343, 344; World War II, 15, 368; causes of, 31.
- Warmongers, 55, 166, 171, 173, 174, 212, 213, 215, 226, 229, 270, 299, 300, 313, 326, 336-337, 348, 354, 371.
- Warmuth, 64.
- Warsaw, 189, 368, 371.
- Washington, 370, 371, 372; *versus* Berlin, 366.
- Weapons, 5, 6, 11, 13, 42, 57, 102, 171, 219, 220, 221, 224, 226, 239, 244, 252, 264, 308, 309, 313, 347, 356, 361.
- Weimar, 327.
- Weltanschauung*, 8, 12, 19, 79, 108, 140, 142, 149, 156, 157, 170, 252, 253; Aryan, 77; National Socialist, 13, 19, 38-39, 270.
- Weltwirtschaftspolitik* (world trade), 26.
- West Prussia, 279.
- Western campaign, 317.
- Western Front, 219.
- Western Hemisphere, 350, 351, 358.
- Whitechapel, 308.
- White House, 337, 350.
- Will, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 30, 32, 42, 43, 44, 45, 51, 57, 76, 78, 87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 94, 97, 103, 106, 109, 110, 113, 114, 123, 126, 127, 139, 140, 142, 146, 148, 149, 167, 169, 176, 186, 202, 219, 221, 235, 236, 238, 240, 241, 242, 252, 253, 283, 288, 289, 302, 305, 319, 338, 349, 354, 365.

Willkie, Wendell, 366.

Wilson, Woodrow, 221, 223, 230, 231-248, 324, 355, 356, 358, 362, 363, 367, 368, 374.

Wimpffen, General von, 58.

Wirth, Dr. Joseph, 56.

Wittelsbach dynasty, 56.

Workers, 69, 73, 74, 75, 82, 102, 103, 106, 108, 112, 116, 124, 177, 192, 207, 221, 258, 263, 271, 325, 327, 329, 331, 337, 343, 364; German, 47, 74, 105, 106, 116, 192, 203, 258, 261, 336.

World-conscience, 76.

World Court, 357.

World discord, 41-42.

World solidarity, 76.

Youth, 88, 89, 102, 105, 119-135, 162, 192, 345; Hostels Organization, 132; Hitler Youth, 123, 131, 132; leader, 126; League of German Girls, 131; organization (movement), 122, 123, 129, 131.

Ypres, 219.

Yugoslavia, 185, 279, 317, 359, 373.